


NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07952383 7



Price One Dollar fine, and Seventy-five Cents coarse copies.


A
VIEW
OF THE
CHARACTER, CAUSES, AND ENDS
OF
THE PRESENT WAR.

JANUARY, 1815.

NEW-YORK

PUBLISHED BY EASTBURN, KIRK AND CO.; WHITING AND
WATSON; AND SMITH AND FORMAN.

Paul & Thomas, Printers.



THE COLLECTION OF
Theodoros Bailey Myers
PRESENTED BY

HIS WIDOW

Catalina Juliana Mason Myers
HIS DAUGHTER

Cassie Mason Myers Julian-James
HIS DAUGHTER-IN-LAW

Edmonia Taylor Phelps Mason
TO THE

New York Public Library
ASTOR, LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
IN MEMORY OF

Theodoros Bailey Myers
AND HIS SON

Theodoros Bailey Myers Mason
LIEUTENANT-COMMANDER


UNITED STATES NAVY
1899

A
SCRIPTURAL VIEW
OF THE
CHARACTER, CAUSES, AND ENDS
OF THE
PRESENT WAR.

SCRIPTURAL VIEW
OF THE
CHARACTER, CAUSES, AND ENDS
OF
THE PRESENT WAR.


——
BY ALEXANDER McLEOD, D. D.

PASTOR OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
NEW-YORK.

——
“Hearken to me; I also will show mine opinion.” ELIAS
“Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it.” MICAH

——
NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY EASTBURN, KIRK AND CO.; WHITING AND
WATSON; AND SMITH AND FORMAN.

——
Paul & Thomas, Printers.

——
1815.



District of New-York, ss.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the Twentieth day of January, in the Thirty-ninth year of the Independence of the United States of America. ALEXANDER M'LEOD, of the said district, has deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, to wit :

"A Scriptural View of the Character, Causes, and Ends of the Present War, by ALEXANDER M'LEOD, D. D. Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, New-York.

"Hearken unto me : I also will show mine opinion." *Elihu.*

"Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it. *Micah.*"

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled "an Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the time therein mentioned." And also to an Act, entitled, "an Act, supplementary to an Act, entitled an Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

THERON RUDD,
Clerk of the Southern District of New-York

PREFACE.

IN a free country, it is the privilege of the subject to examine, and to judge the measures of the government. Where every man is upon the footing of equal rights with another, the rulers are the servants of the public ; their personal qualities, and their official conduct, are of course proper objects of animadversion. If magistrates are found deficient in talents or integrity, they are unfit for their station ; and if their official deportment should prove injurious to the commonwealth, the end of their elevation is not answered, and they should, of course, be dismissed from their employment by the people over whom they unworthily rule. In this country, the right of examining the merit of men in office, and of candidates for power, is fully enjoyed. The press is free ; and any one, who chooses to be at the trouble or expense, may publish his opinions, as well as freely express them in the circle of his private friends. As this liberty is universal, no man has a right to complain of its enjoyment or exercise by another. For the manner, indeed, in which a person sees proper either to speak or to write, he is amenable, according to the laws of courtesy and of equity, to the proper tribunals in civilized life. The

same liberty which guarantees a fair hearing to the opponents of the measures of administration, secures a similar right to those who undertake their vindication. Let the parties contend in the strife of reason ; and truth, upon an equal footing with error, must prevail.

I have exercised, in the discourses now laid before the public, this privilege of a freeman. *I have believed, therefore have I spoken.* If the tendency of my publication, is to support the present administration of the government, the work ought not to be condemned merely on that account. I am ready to acknowledge that a great part of my most intimate literary friends, are in opposition ; but this consideration does not, in the least degree, affect my convictions of truth and righteousness. Against *the present war*, much of that opposition has been directed. I have perceived, grafted upon the strife for place and power, errors which required correction : and, it is for this purpose, more than for the sake of serving the rulers of the land, that I have taken up the subject. Had I thought much less of the *men*, who hold the sceptre, than I do, I would have thought and spoken of the *cause* of my country, precisely as I have done.

These sermons were addressed to christians, from the pulpit ; and for their use, they are principally intended, when issued from the press. Several respectable ministers of religion, took an early stand against the measures of government ; and denounced,

as cruel, and unprovoked, and unjust, the present appeal to arms. These opinions remained long before the public without contradiction; and it appeared, from the activity of their authors, and the silence of others, as if they were incapable of refutation. It was becoming a general opinion, that the clergy and the church were, on the great question between the United States and England, upon the side of the enemy. Many pious people were discouraged; their personal exertions, and their prayers, were affected by this fact: and even, when our own city was under the apprehension of immediate invasion, so great was the force of prejudice, that many men of intelligent piety doubted, whether they could join together in prayer, *for courage to our warriors, and success to our armaments, in order to procure a speedy, an honourable, and a permanent peace.* I beheld with alarm, the extent of the evil of party spirit. I viewed it as a judgment from the Lord; and I became fearful that the clouds of his indignation must thicken around us—that the hand of the enemy, and a long continuance of calamity would become necessary in divine Providence to effect the unanimity, without which, I am still apprehensive, we shall not succeed in putting an end to the contest. I am persuaded, that it requires no more than a DISPLAY OF UNANIMITY IN RESISTING AGGRESSION, to procure at any time an honourable peace. While the enemy expects to divide, why should he seek to conciliate?

The principles which I have laid down, and enforced in these sermons, are not, however, of mere

temporary interest. Whether in peace, or at war, they are of importance to a christian community. They are the permanent principles of social order and public equity. If the work contained a single sentiment of irreligious or immoral tendency, I would cheerfully consign it to the flames. I love mankind, I love the country of my choice, I love the saints; and I desire to promote the best interests of true religion and of civil liberty, because I love my God.

New-York, Jan. 20, 1815.

DISCOURSES, &c.



SERMON I.

Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there : but prophesy not any more at Bethel ; for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court. Then answered Amos, and said to Amaziah, I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son ; but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore-fruit : and the Lord took me as I followed the flock ; and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel. Now, therefore, hear thou the word of the Lord. Amos vii. 12—16.

THE subject, which I propose for discussion in a series of discourses to be delivered on this hour of the Lord's day, has always been considered as lying out of the common routine of pulpit exhibition ; and has moreover, by some, been viewed as altogether without the field in which ministers are appointed to labour. I, of course, at the commencement of my remarks on the present state of our public affairs, anticipate from a judicious audience the question once addressed to our Saviour, although I am

confident it will be proposed in quite a different spirit from that which influenced the Jewish rulers, *by what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?**

It is a wide space, Christians, that separates the line of conduct, which would subject the public ministry of the church to the opinions of men, from that, which treats with contempt the sentiments of a respectable part of the community. *Virtus est medium vitiorum.*† Though I will not be deterred by popular opinion, from prosecuting this subject, I feel it my duty to treat with tenderness, and even respect, the prejudices of valuable men. Therefore do I preface a discussion which may in a certain sense be termed political, with an exhibition of the authority under which, in this instance, I act. Far be it from me to assert the right of enslaving the minds of my hearers into passive obedience to sacerdotal claims; nor shall I insult an audience, which ought to be endowed with christian discernment, by an effort at brow-beating the most humble of my fellow-men. My apology is found in the words of Amos the prophet.

Some explanation is necessary to comprehend the object of my text. The writer was a native of Tekoa, a small town adjacent to the wilderness of Judah. Here he passed his early years, in attending his flocks, and in gathering, in its season, the Egyp-

* Mark xi. 28.

† Cicero.

tian fig, commonly called *sycamore-fruit*. In this pastoral life, Amos, pious and intelligent, enjoyed that happy simplicity which is unembarrassed by the fastidious distinctions of more polished society. He did not belong to the regularly authorized instructors of the church, nor was he educated in their theological schools, *neither a prophet nor a prophet's son* ; but, before he entered upon his public work, he had more than an equivalent for systematic study, and ordinary induction into office : he was divinely called and qualified by inspiration, for an extraordinary mission to the apostatizing tribes of Israel. He was called to the prophetic office when the kingdom of the ten tribes was in its utmost splendour and power, under the second Jeroboam, upwards of one hundred and fifty years after its erection under the first king of the same name.

The throne of Israel had been removed to Samaria ; but still the king maintained a court and a palace, as well as a royal chapel at Bethel, a city bordering upon the kingdom of Judah, and in which the first Jeroboam had established the worship of the golden calf for the purpose of preventing the Israelites from returning to the altar at Jerusalem. That very successful insurgent, a despiser himself of the worship of the true God, was an observer of human nature and of human prejudices, and well understood the importance of some form of religion, (whether true or false was to him immaterial,) as an engine of state policy : and he made no scruples to employ it

as such. His successors upon the throne, appreciated his policy and imitated his example. Bethel, revered by all the tribes as the scene of the remarkable vision of their father Jacob, was still continued as a principal place of devotion, and decorated with a royal court, an opulent hierarchy, and a splendid superstition.

When Amos the prophet visited, by divine direction, this city, Amaziah was at the head of the religion established by law, and in great favour with the court and the king. Resenting the freedom with which the minister of the Lord touched upon the affairs of state, Amaziah accused Amos of treason against Jeroboam, and ordered him out of the kingdom. The whole case is represented in this chapter from the 8th verse.

Amos had denounced both the religion and government of Israel, and predicted their downfall, verse 9. *The sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste, and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword.*

The chief priest of the prevalent idolatry was alarmed at this uncourtly interference with the claims of majesty, and became himself the informer, verse 10. *Then Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, sent to Jeroboam the king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel: the land is not able to bear all his words.*

Whether authorized by the king or not, Amaziah proceeds to forbid the prophet to preach any more such doctrine at Bethel: *for it is the king's court:* verse 12. Amos disregarded the injunction, and boldly addressing himself to Amaziah, said, verse 16, *Now, therefore, hear thou the word of the Lord.*

Here, then, we have the example of an inspired man for introducing, in public, topics of discussion which have a political bearing, together with the remonstrance of Amaziah against the practice. We venture to follow the prophet of the Lord. Nor is this a solitary example of the kind. Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Jeremiah, Daniel, Paul, and John: yea, all the prophets of God, hesitated not to apply their doctrine to political persons and events, whenever a proper occasion presented itself.

In my humble opinion, the present condition of our city and our land is such an occasion. It forces upon our attention a practical question, which we cannot entirely evade. However this war may have originated, it is a fact that it exists, and that we feel its pressure. This city is threatened, and many parts of our country are already invaded by a powerful foe. Our husbandmen are called off from the cultivation of their fields, and our fellow-citizens from their several occupations, in order to be trained to arms, and at the risk of their lives to defend their homes. Our sons, our brothers, and our fathers, our brethren in Christ, who have sat down with us at the table, in order to partake with us in the solemnities

of our holy religion, sleep on the tented field, watch at their posts by night, or march to the cannon's mouth, acting their part in the present contest. And does not this state of things present to christians a practical question? Is it possible that it should not affect the conscience of every disciple of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Shall we, who are yet permitted to meet together in the temple, accompany our brethren who march to the battle with prayers for their success, and welcome the survivors upon their return home, both to our affections and to the place which they occupied among the saints; or shall we now withhold from them, while they brave the danger, both our sympathy and our prayers for success; and afterwards refuse to acknowledge them as regular members of the church of God, or expel them from her communion as men who have unworthily hired themselves to shed innocent blood in an unjust war? If this war be absolutely unrighteous, then is it not only criminal to support it; but also those who do support it, are guilty of blood, and censurable as such before the church.

I might justify myself, of course, for considering this subject, under existing circumstances, upon the ground of ecclesiastical order; but, I choose rather to rest my right of introducing it into the pulpit upon a broader basis. With this view, I submit the following proposition.

Ministers have the right of discussing from the pulpit those political questions which affect christian morals.

I prove this right—and remove objections.

I. *Prove that we have such right.*

The object to be accomplished by our ministry—The scriptural history—The system of sacred prediction—And the precepts which we are commissioned to expound, are the sources of argumentation to which I refer you in proof of this claim of right.

1. The object of our ministry is, nowhere, more summarily expressed than in the words of our Saviour in granting, immediately before his ascension into heaven, the apostolical commission, Matth. 28. 19. *Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations.* The word, in the original, which we render teach,* signifies more than the diffusion of knowledge. It conveys the idea of forming disciples; and of course includes all that *instruction in righteousness*, which belongs to christians.

It is impossible without perversion of language to exclude from such instruction every thing which has a political bearing. Ministers are authorized to go throughout the world, and thus instruct all nations

* Μαθητεύσατε.

upon the face of the earth ; and the object of their ministry cannot be said to be completely accomplished until nations, as such, shall have submitted to the rule of righteousness. Individuals, indeed, may be converted, and edified, and glorified ; churches may be organized, and enlarged, and comforted ; and even bodies politic may experience some advantage from the christian religion : in all these instances the honour of the Deity is promoted on earth ; but the object of the ministry of the word of God is not fully answered unless *the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord*, and all nations made to feel the influence of christianity. If religion is of any use in this world, or in the world to come, it is useful for man, in every relation of life : and certainly, no christian, who seriously considers the value of religion, to know, and love, and serve God, by obeying in every situation his commandments, can continue to doubt the propriety of acting religiously in the important concerns of civil life. From the obligations of the word of God, no man is exempt. Directions are addressed to the military as well as to the clergy.* It is unreasonable then, to deprive the ministers of religion of the right of speaking upon any subject whatever, that has respect to sin and duty, or that affects the moral conduct of men and of nations. How shall we ever realize the hope inspired by these assertions, *righteousness exalteth a nation*—*The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord*, if christian di-

* Luke iii. 14.

vines have no right to apply the principles of revealed religion to the concerns of political life ?

2. The scriptural history cannot be explained or applied without touching on political topics. The sacred writers treated of the political concerns of their own, and of preceding ages, and have set us the example. Deny us the right of expressing political sentiments, and of remarking upon national conduct and events, and a great part of the sacred volume will necessarily remain unexplained before our eyes, and comparatively useless. Every man, who believes in the providence of God, will admit that all true history is worthy of attention as a developement of the divine government over human affairs ; as an exposition of the principles of human action ; and as a record of facts and events useful for the direction of our conduct in every situation of life : and shall we not be permitted to avail ourselves of such aid in the instruction of the several ranks of our hearers ? We are assured, by the inspired writers, that national concerns are made subordinate to the interests of true religion : and, it is obvious to all, that there is an intimate connexion between political events, and the interests of the christian church. Where, then, is the propriety of sealing up our lips, that we may not speak of the divine providence, or point out the agency of our Saviour in overruling, for the good of Zion, the changes which take place among the nations of the earth ?

3. The prophecies of scripture can never be explained without political discussion.

The prospective history contained in the bible, as well as the narration of past events, interweaves the story of the rise and fall of empire, with that of the church of God; and the whole is employed for the purpose of instructing the saints, and of supporting their hopes and benevolent exertions. The education of believers, of which the bible is unquestionably the perfect standard, cannot correspond with their diversified conditions, temptations, and duties, if all their civil relations be excluded from consideration, and their pastors utterly prohibited from expounding those portions of scripture which exhibit mankind in their collective capacity and character. Individual man is certainly a very interesting object of attention and study. The christian, from the first moments of his spiritual life; throughout the whole progress of this his new and better nature to the perfection of the man of God; in the trying hour of his separation from the world; and in his future state of endless enjoyment; furnishes the public teachers and private members of the church, with abundant matter of useful discourse and reflection: but, the social concerns of the rational creature, as they occupy a great portion of our time; give exercise to all our powers; and affect all our duties and enjoyments; must not be forgotten in the application of the word of truth, to the moral part of the tenants of this world, who are preparing for the high society which we hope to enter when

our pilgrimage is finished. No man can be permitted to explain the prophecies which are already accomplished, unless he be allowed to apply the fact to the prediction: and for the same reason, those, which are now fulfilling, or hereafter to be fulfilled, cannot be pointed out to the friends of religion, unless we have a right to bring into view in our public ministrations great political events and characters. Let the experiment be made upon the books, written by Daniel and John, and the truth of my assertion will be universally confessed.

4. A more copious and conclusive argument in support of our right, to preach what may, in a certain sense, be denominated politics, is derived from the precepts of inspiration which we are required to proclaim to the world. *The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.**

It will not, I hope, be denied, that christian ministers have a right to make the commandments of their God a subject of discussion. *The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.†* There is, I admit, some danger of abusing this and every other right which we possess; and for such abuse we deserve correction. In proportion, too, to the danger of misrepresenting the word of truth, should be our

* Mal. ii. 7.

† Rom. vii. 12.

caution in the selection and discussion of subjects before the public. This caution is peculiarly necessary for those ministers who venture upon political remarks. Our own partialities are apt to betray us into error. The acuteness of an independent people, alive to their political interests, is waiting to detect our aberrations. A feverish sensibility, inseparable from the deep intrigues of selfish policy, renders a few incapable of hearing without misapprehension, and of speaking without misrepresentation. *Some have swerved from a good conscience, and have turned aside unto vain jangling ; desiring to be teachers of the law ; understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm. But we know that the law is good if a man use it lawfully.** And it is impossible to make any use of some parts of the divine law, without entering upon discussions that may be termed political. If I can show to you, my christian brethren, from this volume, by which alone you are bound to try my ministry among you, that the law of God gives directions about the several great concerns of civil polity, you will not again call in question my right, to declare, from this place, the duty required of us in relation to civil life. Bear with me, for a little, and I shall quote for your inspection passages, which prescribe *The mode of constituting civil rulers—The character of such as administer the government—The duty of the constituted authorities—The conduct proper upon the part of subjects*—passages which

* 1 Tim. i. 5—8.

Reprove them who confer power improperly—and Threaten magistrates who are unmindful of their high obligations.

All these are political doctrines, which the Governor of the universe commands us to teach to the nations of the earth.

1. The mode of constituting rulers, is by electing, to the several departments of state, suitable characters from among the people over whom they are to exercise authority. Exod. xviii. 21. *Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them to be rulers.* The chief concern of a nation in forming its arrangements, ought to be the wise and equitable distribution of power into proper hands. The divine rule for doing this, now quoted, has never been surpassed. It is adapted to every nation; and its excellence obvious to every man of understanding. The prerequisites, in a candidate for power, are plainly stated. They are four, capacity, piety, integrity, and disinterestedness. They appear, too, in the order of their relative importance. First, capacity—*able men*. The ignorant, the feeble, the foolish, and the insane, are discarded, as obviously unfit to bear office among rational beings. Second, piety—*such as fear God*. The sceptic, the vicious, and the profane, are rejected from authority over the accountable subjects of the divine moral government. Third, integrity—*men of*

truth. The ambitious, the dissembler, and the hypocrite, being unprincipled, are dangerous and unworthy of trust. Fourth, disinterestedness—*hating covetousness.* The selfish, and the mercenary man would sacrifice the public good at the shrine of an individual servant.

The general maxim of polity, from which all these directions flow, is, that no provisions of a constitution of government, however wisely adopted, can preserve the liberties and promote the good of society, unless they be administered by suitable officers. *Measures*, the object; and, for their sakes, *proper men.* In this view, I consider as correct, the declaration of a great parliamentary orator, “How vain then, how idle, how presumptuous is the opinion, that laws can do every thing? and how weak and pernicious the maxim founded upon it, that measures, not men, are to be attended to!”*

2. The character, to be supported by those who are in power in any commonwealth, is expressly prescribed, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3. *The God of Israel said—He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.*

If government be instituted for the good of the community, and not for the pleasure of an individual, as the divine law declares and common sense admits, provision ought to be made for the

* Fox's Hist. Phil. 1803, page 14.

speedy removal of a public servant who is unworthy of the trust reposed in him. The law must of course be applied to his character during the whole period of his continuance in office. If he cannot bear the test, a more worthy personage ought to be selected in order to occupy in his room. In vain would the divine law appoint a criterion, unless it were proper to dispossess the occupant who could not endure its application. The constitution of government, which requires base men, or those otherwise disqualified for the duties of a high station, to continue in power for life, is on that very account inconsistent with the bible. The criterion specified in the passage before you, is both obvious and of easy application. It is twofold—*justness to men, and reverence for their Creator. He that ruleth over men*—moral agents united by social ties, during the time he continues in power, *must*, of necessity, exhibit these qualifications. If he be unjust to men, these men ought, for their own sakes, to dispossess him; and if he have no respect for the Creator, men, accountable to him who is worthy of esteem and fear, ought, in testimony of their allegiance to the almighty Governor of nations, to remove from influence and honour the despiser of his name and law.

3. It is required of the constituted authorities of a nation, that they officially recognize the christian religion, and cherish the interests of the church of Jesus Christ. Psalm ii. 10, 12. *Be wise, now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the*

earth. Serve the Lord with fear—Kiss the Son lest he be angry.

As it is the will of God, declared in the constitution of human nature and in the circumstances of human life, as well as in the scriptures, that men should associate under suitable regulations, he prescribes for those, who frame and execute laws in a commonwealth so formed, their duty in relation to himself their sovereign Lord, almighty Protector, and omniscient Judge. It is their *wisdom* to comply—to hear, understand, and obey his divine injunctions, revealed in the christian religion.

4. The course of conduct, becoming the subjects of such equitable and righteous rulers, is also pointed out, and the reason upon which it is founded, is connected with the precept. Rom. xiii. 1, 5, 6. *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers ; for there is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath but for conscience' sake. For this cause, pay ye tribute also : for they are God's ministers attending continually on this very thing.*

The *duty* specified is conscientious submission : that submission to be expressed by obedience to the law, and the punctual payment of such sums, as are required for the maintenance of public credit, and the support of the government. The *reasons* annexed are sufficiently forcible. The rulers of the na-

tion, are its public servants, and of course to be supported by those who appoint them: being appointed, they are the servants of God for the maintenance of moral order; and reverence for *him* will produce respect for *them*. "They are ordained of God. They are God's ministers, attending continually on this very thing."

The controversy, about *the divine right* of both the MITRE and the CROWN, is passing rapidly into oblivion. The theory of civil polity, is from the scriptures, very easily understood. The formation of constitutions, and the election of officers, are the work of the community; and thus, *government is the ordinance of man*. Jehovah, the God of order and equity, approves of the civil association formed upon moral principles, and sanctions with his own high authority the proper exercise of legitimate power. Thus, *government is the ordinance of God*. 1 Pet. ii. 13—15. *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, whether it be to the king or unto governors, for so is the will of God*. Rom. xiii. 2. *Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God*.

5. The Sovereign of the universe threatens with his divine displeasure, those who contrive and maintain governments, otherwise than upon true moral principles. Hos. viii. 3, 4, 13. *Israel hath cast off the thing that is good: the enemy shall pursue him. They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not. Now will he remember their iniquities, and visit their sins*.

In this chapter, the sin of creating and maintaining an immoral system of civil polity is connected with that of an abuse of religion. It was the crime of Israel, as well as of other nations, both ancient and modern, to couple together an abuse of religion and government into one complex system of impiety and misrule. This has always been effected by the evil management of designing men, who availed themselves of the ignorance, the apathy, and the vices of the people at large, in order to promote their own schemes of ambition. But these are not alone in the blame. The Lord in his word declares the whole community guilty, and threatens them with deserved punishment. His providence is a continual commentary upon the declaration, and a constant execution of the threatening. The body of a nation suffers under bad government. The *fact* cannot be disputed. The *justness* of this measure is easily shown. The population of a country have the power. They can, if they will, pull down, build up, alter, and amend the system of social order. When they submit to *thrones of iniquity which frame mischief by law*, their condition is not merely a state of suffering which we may pity, but also a fault which we are to blame. If through neglect or discord, they do not co-operate in reform, suffer they justly must. *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?*

6. Civil rulers who neglect their duty, and abuse their power, are also threatened with divine judgments. Psalm xciv. 20. 23. *Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief*

by a law? He shall bring upon them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; yea, the Lord our God shall cut them off.

Iniquity is displeasing to the Lord, because it is contrary to his nature. The splendour of human greatness, and the pomp of human power, although they dazzle our eyes and impose upon our credulity, will not prevent him from judging righteously; and the greatness of the mischief, consequent upon the transgressions of men in power, instead of screening them from detection, will increase their condemnation. Elevated as the higher ranks of life are above the censures of the community, and unrestrained as is their consequent indulgence in crime, they cannot escape with impunity from him who refuses fellowship with them in their illegitimate authority. “Hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?”*

In these judgments, which are inflicted upon those who neglect to rule according to the principles of the moral law, however heavy they fall, christians, so far as they are influenced by scriptural advice and example, will readily acquiesce. *O Lord, thou hast ordained them for judgment; and, O mighty God, thou hast established them for correction. Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity.*†

* Numb. xxiii. 19.

† Hab. i. 12, 13.

From this collation, of passages selected from the standard of our faith and practice, and embracing the whole theory of civil polity, you will readily perceive the force of my argument in support of the *right* which I now claim. If the divine law be the rule of our christian ministry, and the scriptures be the bond of connexion between pastor and people, then have I shown the authority, under which I act in introducing this discussion, to be perfectly competent.

I claim the privilege of explaining the law of my God. I claim it, too, not *merely* as a privilege, which I am at liberty to use. It is not even optional to the ministers of religion whether to use it or not: they are bound by their public instructions, as ambassadors for Christ, to raise a voice which shall reach to both the cottage and the throne, and teach their several occupants their respective duties. “*Go,*” said our arisen Lord to his ministers, when handing to them their commission, “*disciple all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*” We must, my brethren, in order to be faithful to our exalted employer, have it in our power to say upon a review of our ministry, after an example of approved excellence, “*I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God.*”*

II. *Remove Objections.*

* Acts xx. 27

There are many, who admit that the public teachers of the christian churches have a right, both as citizens of the commonwealth, and as interpreters of the oracles of God, to express their sentiments on political subjects, who, nevertheless, deem it inexpedient to exercise the right. Prudence, lest by giving offence, they frustrate the more important objects of their ministry; personal timidity, lest they provoke disrespect and opposition; christian tenderness, lest they should wound the feelings of a pious hearer; and in some, perhaps, a sense of their own incompetency, or an ignoble pusillanimity, prevent the ministers of religion generally from introducing political remarks in their discourses. In abstaining from the exercise of this right, let christian pastors use their own discretion: I am willing to admit, that we ought rarely touch on such points; but an absolute prohibition cannot be supported by any solid reasonings. The following summary comprehends all the arguments, with which I am acquainted, against the right of introducing politics to the pulpit.

Christ crucified is the proper theme of ministerial discussion—The kingdom of the Redeemer is not of this world—Ministers have the care of souls and not of the bodily estate—Gospel hearers are divided in political opinions—Political remarks are unfavourable to devotion—Preachers are dictatorial, and usually opposed to civil liberty.

I proceed, to the examination of these objections, with a confidence that, without injury to the feelings

of any candid mind, I shall be able to prove them invalid.

1. *Objection.* "Christ and him crucified is the proper theme of pulpit discussion; and, therefore, it is improper to introduce political concerns."

In examining this objection, I joyfully, as well as readily, admit the precious truth contained in the assertion upon which the argument is supposed to rest. With my hand upon my heart, I repeat, in your ears, the words of the great evangelizer of the Gentiles, "For *I* determined not to know any thing among *you*, save Jesus Christ and him crucified."* And from that determination, if I ever recede, *let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.*†

This declaration, however, neither supports the objection, nor excludes from the pulpit the duties of civil life. We are not to confine our ministry to the mere *words* "Christ crucified." The *doctrines* of the cross must be inculcated. We are not to confine our discussion to the *fact* of Christ's death; but must preach of his person, his covenant, his mission, his work, his power, his providence, and his law; and that law, in its application to man in his social as well as individual capacity.

The apostle Paul himself, who first employed the words referred to, understood them in this latitude.

* 1 Cor. ii. 2.

† Psalm cxxxvii. 6.

He inculcated the doctrines of grace. *He* proclaimed the duties of domestic and of civil life. *He* spake of rulers, and of their laws, and of their subjects. *He shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God.*

The prophets, who preceded Paul, in diffusing the light of revealed truth, had acted in the same manner; and the Lord himself, when he appeared on earth, spake of other subjects, as well as of *the decease which he was to accomplish in Jerusalem*. Following their example we, too, would give this extension to our ministry, “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.”

That very reason, which the objector urges against the introduction into the pulpit of political remarks, we esteem as an argument in its favour. The objection proceeds upon the principle, that the gospel doctrine, the christian religion, is to be perpetually separated from the polity of nations; we go upon the directly opposite principle, that civil rule should be regulated by the maxims of christian law. Seeing, therefore, that we determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified; we introduce into this place our political sentiments, and invite you to correct, by the revelation of truth, all your political maxims and actions. Let us recommend in the same breath, religious and civil duty. *Love the brotherhood—Fear God—Honour the King.**

* 1 Pet. ii. 17.

2. *Objection.* “ The kingdom of the Redeemer is not of this world ; and therefore the ministers of the Redeemer should not interfere with the kingdoms of this world.”

Far be it from me to deny the truth of the maxim with which this objection commences. It is a part of that good confession, which the faithful and true witness made before the Roman deputy, who exercised over subjugated Palestine, the iron sway of the Cæsars. Pontius Pilate, agitated by a consciousness of the innocence of Jesus Christ, and of his own guilt, and labouring to devise means for delivering the victim of Jewish malevolence without risking his own popularity, proposed, from the judgment-seat, which he so unworthily filled, the question, *Art thou the king of the Jews ?* Jesus answered, *My kingdom is not of this world.** He admitted that he was a king. He bore witness unto the truth ; and the truth is, that he is *King of kings—higher than the kings of the earth.†* How then are we to understand the assertion, “ my kingdom is not of this world ?” In its most obvious meaning. His power is from a higher source. It is of God. It is not from the election of the people, nor the appointment of the Emperor. It is Jehovah, who said to him, *Sit thou at my right hand—Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.‡* If, therefore, his kingdom is not of this world, it is

* John xviii. 33, 36. † Psalm lxxxix. 27. ‡ Psalm ii. 8.

*of God: it is over the world: The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all.**

So far, then, from furnishing an objection against the claim of right which we make, is this principle, that it in fact establishes it beyond all dispute. The kingdom of Christ is *of* God, *over* the nations, therefore we apply the laws of that kingdom to the national polity. We shall never recognize as valid the claim of Satan, though termed *the god of this world*, to the sovereignty over the nations; but shall endeavour to rescue them from the dominion of the usurper, and restore them in allegiance to their lawful governor, “the prince of the kings of the earth.” The Saviour himself, when the adversary tempted him, by a requisition of homage, and an offer of power over the world, refused both the demand, and the gift, because worship is due only unto God; and from God himself, the Redeemer had already obtained all power over the kingdoms of the earth. The church of Christ is *in* this world. Christians are concerned in the kingdoms *of* this world, as rulers and ruled. The kingdom of Christ is not *of*, but *over* this world. The ministers of Christ have therefore a right to treat of all the moral concerns of human society.

3. *Objection.* “As ministers have the care of souls, and not of the bodily estate of men, they

* Psalm ciii. 19.

should not be permitted to treat of any except spiritual subjects."

The great concern of every pastor who is faithful to the people whom he serves, is to feed the flock of God with knowledge and understanding. It is mind that makes the man ; and the interest of one soul is more to be sought after, because, in reality, more valuable, than the whole world. I know that the oracles of God inform you, who hear the gospel, that the rulers of Israel *watch for your souls, as they that must give account.** Wo to the unfaithful pastor who forgets the souls of men, or refuses to minister to their edification.

The improvement of mind, however, does not require the neglect of the body. These constituents of living man, are intimately connected by a divine hand. Both were assumed by the Saviour, and redeemed by his blood. In both, we glorify God on earth, and shall enjoy him in heaven. The material world is created for the sake of the moral ; and it is upheld by Messiah for the sake of revealing his perfections, in the salvation of men. Matter itself, therefore, may be referred to in our ministry ; and useful remarks, upon its nature and its laws, may, without incurring the blame of injuring the cause of spirituality, be interwoven with pulpit exhibitions. Politics respect not the bodily estate only, or even principally. They affect mind, morals, piety, com-

* Heb. xiii. 17.

fort and duty. So far as they do so, they may come under review. It is not to settle the claims for empire, to define geographical boundaries, or to adjust the contentings of human ambition; but in order to aid the christian in maintaining a conscience void of offence towards God and man, that we would ever introduce the subject into the public worship of our God. In order to promote the good of souls, and not with the design of diminishing your spiritual-mindedness, we urge this duty, that, with spiritual views of political movements, you may intermingle with the world; that *whatsoever ye do, whether ye eat or drink, ye may do all to the glory of God.** All things, not excepting political events, are for your sakes. The whole of the nations are subordinate to the church, the spiritual spouse of Immanuel. *I am the Lord thy God, the holy one of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee; therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life.*†

The judicious minister will weigh, in the balance of the sanctuary, every subject, for the purpose of determining its importance. He will rarely enter upon political topics. He will never descend to questions of mere party: but there are times in which he ought not to be silent, respecting the conduct of nations, or of christians in their civil capacity.

* 1 Cor. x. 31.

† Isa. xlii. 3, 4.

4. *Objection.* “Gospel-hearers are usually so divided, on political subjects, that ministers ought not to give offence by expressing their own opinions.”

Christians are, alas, divided : and the pride of opinion in their distracted state, does much mischief. It is the policy of the mere men of this world to keep them divided ; and the god of this world triumphs in their want of unanimity and cordiality. If christians did uniformly co-operate, Satan’s servants and kingdom could not prosper. But the professors of religion are divided, not about politics only ; every doctrine of christianity, every article of ecclesiastical order, has been a subject of dispute and contention. Are not the ambassadors of Christ, at liberty to preach disputed doctrines, and enforce any particular discipline or rule, even although some professed christians should withhold their assent ? Certain public teachers, may, indeed, esteem it convenient to act upon this maxim, and never support any one system of doctrine or of order. These are not the examples of our ministry. Evangelical truths, I know, are more important, infinitely more important, than the common causes of party contention in politics ; therefore they require the more attention. When occasion requires, however, the mere fact, that men are of different politics, ought not to prevent the application of the word of God to their disputes. Political morality is essential to christianity.

Am I told, that this will do no good : that it will only give offence : that it will alienate the affections

of one set of politicians from the pastor: that it will mar his usefulness; and create personal enemies to himself? Who makes these assertions? Men who are mild and free from political bias? or men who are full of violence, and determined to execute the threatening? In the discharge of my duty, I will fearlessly run this risk. I will try whether, in this liberal age, the candid investigation of the subject before me, without ungenerous allusion or invective, will create me personal enemies. I will make the experiment, whether it be possible for any minister of religion to prefer the cause of his country to that of its powerful foe, without provoking the resentment of party spirit. If I suffer, I am prepared for it: but I do not expect any such treatment. Men of different religious sentiments hear without passion the same sermon. Are they, then, more concerned about political than religious truth, and disposed to resent a difference of opinion on that subject, more than on subjects relative to their eternal interests. I cannot, as yet, admit this to be the case. I confidently indulge the hope, that there is more liberality, among those who attend upon gospel ordinances, than to deny to us the right, which they exercise themselves, of forming each his own sentiments, on political morality, and of modestly expressing them to the world.

We presume not to prescribe for you. We do not dictate to you in the choice of public officers. We allow you to judge for yourselves. We only require of you a similar permission for us: and,

upon this subject, while we cautiously avoid the use of intemperate language, we have only to ask, that you do justice to our arguments, and to the motives with which they are offered.

5. *Objection.* “Political remarks are unfavourable to devotion; and therefore unsuitable to the pulpit.”

In endeavouring to obviate this objection, I feel as if I had to encounter the most difficult task which my subject imposes upon me. The devotional feelings of many professed christians are so feeble, and have so little foundation in moral principle, that they are readily deranged or removed. Others, who have learned only the rudiments of religion, seldom consider it in any other light than as matter of mental comfort to an individual, without having any relation to their improvement and usefulness as members of society. As they would give their attention to the things of time, uninfluenced by christian principles, they may wish to fix in the sanctuary their attention upon the concerns of eternity, without any reference to a general reformation of either church or state. It is ever to be expected, that those, who are unwilling to *consider* religiously their political concerns, will be as unwilling to *behave* religiously in their political transactions.

This is the way to produce a separation between the two subjects. And yet the separation cannot be complete, unless all christians are secluded from

every concern in national politics; and the entire management devolved upon those, who will not be tempted to think of the bible, as the rule, or of piety, as the principle, according to which civilians should act: and where would this end; but in the transfer of the undivided management of national affairs into the hands of infidels.

The principle of this objection, while it appears to proceed from spiritual-mindedness, is near of kin to the unenlightened devotion of the recluse or the hermit, who retires from the world into a life of solitude. It approaches monastic holiness more than the piety of Abraham, of Elijah, of Daniel, of Paul, and of John the Divine. These were men of piety. They taught, and they practised the duties of political life, both in peace and in war, without thinking that it injured devotion: and even, *in the spirit on the Lord's day*, the beloved disciple is directed by his arisen Lord, to write of the contendings and changes of empire.

Believe me, brethren, if our religion is of the right description, and exists in a proper measure, we shall certainly be enabled to contemplate the providence of God in all human affairs, and apply the law of God to questions of civil polity, without either endangering a pious frame of mind, or engendering the evil passions of worldly politicians. I confess, however, that I feel, at the same time, for the infirmities of the weak; and should be disposed to avoid any thing that might have a tendency to mar their feeble

devotion, did not duty require of the ambassadors of Christ, to apply the law of their God to all questions of practical morality.

6. *Objection.* “ Preachers are usually dictatorial, and opposed to the religious and civil liberties of men. It is painful to be under the necessity of publicly contradicting them, and it is therefore better for them to omit political remarks in the pulpit.”

The habit of public speaking without danger of interruption, or immediate opposition to the declarations which they make, as it is required by the respect due to devotional exercises, and enjoyed by the ministers of religion, is calculated to cherish, upon their part, a decision of expression, which may border upon the dogmatic. It is probable, nevertheless, that the pulpit orator, is, usually, as far removed from this extreme, as the members of the senate, or the gentlemen of the bar. A man of mind, convinced himself of the truth of his assertions, will, in any situation, speak with an air of confidence; but there is no necessity of his treating with contumely the sentiments of such as think differently from him: and it is especially unbecoming the pulpit to affect contempt for the persons of men. If it be a fact, that a multitude of religious instructors are found friendly to arbitrary power and to an illegitimate subserviency of church to state polity, it is surely no good reason for preventing men, who understand and value the rights both of God and man, from

pointing out the duty of christians in relation both to ecclesiastical and civil society. It is not difficult to account for the fact, that so many of the sacerdotal order have inclined to despotism, and yet show, that the liberal discussion of such topics from the pulpit is truly favourable to the real liberties of men.

Licentiousness is as remote from civil liberty as is tyranny itself. The righteousness which exalteth a nation, includes intelligence and public morality. No moral improvement can take place without regard to religion: and christianity, as opposed to infidelity, to superstition, and to lawless power, is emphatically the religion of "peace upon earth, and of good will towards men." It is the religion of benevolence to man, as well as piety towards God, and of course the only "perfect law of liberty." You will allow me to add, that no means whatever can be possibly successful in finally rescuing from usurpation the liberties of mankind, and of purifying and perpetuating them, without the aid of the religion taught by the Son of God. This alone is effectual in changing the heart, from whence proceed the ambition and the strife which have been the causes both of arbitrary domination and wasteful wars among the nations of the earth. When I shall have pointed out the causes which incline the ministers of the church, to the side of arbitrary power among the nations, I shall illustrate this sentiment with a review of facts, and so conclude my apology for introducing this subject into the pulpit.

1. Account for the fact, that christian ministers should, in despite of the tendency of the christian religion to favour the cause of civil liberty, be often found among the supporters of the interests of arbitrary power.

It is not to be expected, among men of imperfect faculties and of like passions with others, that they should be perfectly conformed to the divine law, or even, in every case, assimilated to the examples which divine revelation records with approbation. They are capable of being, in part, affected by surrounding circumstances, where they are piously disposed; and, it is not to be questioned, that, in many instances, men enter into the ministry with unsanctified hearts, as the means of procuring a convenient livelihood. The great body of the priesthood of the nations will accordingly yield to the force of circumstances, and there are found so many exciting causes to prejudice the mind against civil liberty, that it is easy to account for the fact which we deplore.

These causes are to be found in the ecclesiastical establishments of the nations—The personal ambition of ecclesiastics—The power of fear—And the inclination to propagate their own opinions, natural to all men.

First. The ecclesiastical establishments among the nations, secure a very great proportion of all the clergy in the christian world, upon the side of

the system of civil rule, by which they are supported, many of them in great splendour and opulence. They are themselves, as much as the Egyptian, Chaldean, or Roman hierarchies, a part of the national government, and as such identified with the prevailing despotism. They, of course, and also as many as can be influenced by their doctrine and example, will be disposed to coincide with tyrannical power.*

Second. Personal ambition is, everywhere, in a greater or less degree, to be found. Clerical ambition was found in the apostolical age, and it has never yet diminished ; but still continues to agitate the churches. That civil liberty, which offers restraint to its exercise, and which denies gratification to its desires, will not receive so much of its aid, as a more splendid and powerful system, which can reward its services, by reducing within its reach the objects which it is anxious to compass—rank, influence, and opulence. Discerning statesmen, of arbitrary and ambitious views, will understand their men ; and the understanding becomes mutual.

* “ *Human establishments have always been made engines of state policy : they have promoted hypocrisy and infidelity—the great evil has been in the civil magistrate usurping the throne of Christ, and exercising spiritual dominion—Here,*” in the United States, “ *is an asylum for you, our brethren of the old world, whose lives are embittered by the cruel impositions of men ; the fruit of whose labours go to support lazy priests and luxurious princes ; who though you rise early, and late take rest, obtain only a scanty subsistence for yourselves and families.*” *The blessings of America. A sermon. by the late Dr. Linn, of New-York, 1791.*

Third. The fear of infidelity, ruinous as that system is, not only to ecclesiastical authority, but to good morals, and to present and future happiness, has driven many of the best men of the present age, into an unhappy attachment to the doctrines of the old antichristian school. Irreligion formed, especially at the commencement of the French revolution, a temporary connexion with liberty against the dominion of European despotism; and virtuous minds, not capable of sufficient discrimination, rejected liberty on account of her evil associate. Designing men looked upon the connexion with pleasure, as affording an opportunity of sounding the alarm, and reducing into discredit the cause of liberty as if inseparable from impiety and licentiousness. Ministers, like others, took the alarm; and although the scriptures assure us, that no other evil is to have such destructive influence in the church, as the antichristian polity of superstitious establishments, they spake, in private, and from the pulpit, as if democracy and deism were the only calamity to the church of God. In the course of a few years, of madness and misrule upon the part of France, habits of opposition to revolutions, and of attachments to ancient despotism, have been so strongly formed, that, even now, when history proves the danger to have been visionary, and France has actually returned to her ancient boundaries, and her ancient superstition, under her former race of kings; the practice continues of presenting liberty arrayed in the garb of infidelity, as an object of execration and universal abhorrence. Another generation will scarcely credit the extent of the panic among the

churches of the reformation. They will be amazed on learning from history, that distinguished and intelligent protestants in our own country, had been driven by their fears of French infidelity, so far into a forgetfulness of the faith of their fathers, and of the recent struggles which established their national liberties, as to hail like the millennium, an event which tended to consolidate European despotisms; which restored to power the man of sin, with all the gloomy terrors of the Roman inquisition; and which afforded the opportunity to their ancient foe, of pouring out his victorious legions upon their own shores.

Fourth. It is natural for men to express their opinions to others; and to be uneasy under restraint. Ministers of religion are as much disposed as any of their fellow-citizens to propagate their own sentiments. Their habits render them as impatient, under restraint, and of opposition, as any class of men. They, of course, incline to those political partizans who guarantee and encourage the exercise of their right. When they open their bibles, they discover political precepts which they are to expound. If the friends of freedom should, under misapprehension, manifest an unwillingness to permit such exposition, and their political opponents by every means encourage it, a prejudice must immediately arise in favour of the latter. Unhappily for our country, this is very generally the case. And yet, however obvious the effect produced by these causes, separate or combined, it is a misrepresentation of the

most injudicious and unjust description, to class the ministers of christianity indiscriminately among the enemies of civil freedom. Real religion is the best friend of rational liberty.

2. History vindicates the character of christian ministers, and holds them up to view, as furnishing, in every age, some instances of the most intrepid and successful resistance to the foes of freedom.

We do not carry you back, for proofs of this assertion, to the ages of inspiration ; for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthah ; of David also, and *Samuel, and of the prophets*: who, through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.* Nor do we refer you to the history of the Maccabean brethren, who signalized their zeal and their constancy, against the tyrant Antiochus, in defence of the liberty and religion of their country. The story of more recent times, makes us acquainted with ministers of christianity, who vindicated the cause of God and man at the peril of their lives, against the encroachments and pretensions of arbitrary power. In the era of the reformation, it was by the aid of christian divines, that men became acquainted with their sacred rights: Zuinglius, and

* Heb. 11. 32—34.

Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, like Moses, who *fear-ed not the wrath of the king*, said to the enslavers of their brethren, *let my people go*; and in the words of Samuel, when Saul had rent his mantle, *the Lord hath rent the kingdom from thee*, did they venture to address both kings and emperors. Who more va-lorious in restoring the liberties of Holland; in con- quering the veterans of Alva; and in resisting Philip the tyrant, than the thousands who wept under the ministry of their patriotic and faithful pas- tors, before the gates of Antwerp and Haerlem. Throughout the several provinces of the Nether- lands, the founders of that famous republic were ac- customed to meet in arms, to hear sermons from preachers for whose heads rewards were in vain of- fered by the foes of liberty and truth. Scotland, the *original country of the WHIGS*, led on by her faithful pastors, introduced the name and the spirit into England; and, by the aid of the puritan ministers, succeeded in the temporary reformation of both the sanctuary and the throne. To these advocates of li- berty, the British empire stands to this day under ob- ligation for all the freedom enjoyed by the constitu- tion. In encouraging and effecting the American re- volution, the exertions and influence of christian mi- nisters, in the pulpit, in the congress, and in the field, were felt and duly appreciated: and there are yet among our own pastors, men, who, in despite of the baleful influence of party spirit, feel the force of piety and patriotism, and remember their duty to the cause of equity, their country, and their God. If the rights and liberties of this great and growing empire are

doomed to perish, their last abode will be found along the side of the pulpits of the ministers of religion. There are men, in that sacred office, who would, in such a case, use upon better principles than did the Roman orator, the words which he put on the lips of his distinguished client, Titus Annius Milo, "I will withdraw and retire into exile: if I cannot be a member of a virtuous commonwealth, it will be some satisfaction not to live in a bad one; and, as soon as I set foot in a well-regulated and free state, there will I fix my abode—*quam-primum tetigero bene moratam et liberam civitatem, in ea conquiescam.*" But, no! Liberty shall not perish! The daughter of Zion rejoices in her fellowship. Peace and prosperity shall hereafter visit our land, and dwell in our habitations. The Lord hasten it in his own time, and unto him be glory in Christ Jesus, *world without end.* AMEN.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF THE TWO BELLIGERENTS.



SERMON II.

TEKEL; *Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.* Dan. v. 27.

THIS solemn sentence was pronounced by a prophet of God, upon one of the most splendid and powerful monarchies that ever existed. At a very critical period, and under circumstances of the most alarming kind, Daniel ventured to proclaim this unwelcome truth, before the assembled lords and rulers of Chaldea.

Belshazzar, the *Nabonadius* of the Greek historians, and the son of Evil-merodac, by his queen, the celebrated Nitocris, now sat upon the throne of Nebuchadnezzar, his grandfather, and the most famous of the kings of Babylon. It was on the 17th year of his criminal and calamitous reign, and on the anniversary of a festival sacred to the idol-god, SHESHACH, that Belshazzar ordered an entertainment for his thousand lords, in the spacious halls of his proud

palace. He forgot, amidst his wine, and his revelry, that he was in a besieged city. For two years had the united armies of the far-famed Cyrus of Persia, and of his uncle Darius the Mede, laid siege to Babylon, the most magnificent metropolis of the world. Babylon, covering a square of sixty miles circumference, watered by the great river Euphrates, surrounded by a wall of eighty-seven feet in thickness, and of corresponding height, strengthened by three hundred towers of defence, and provisioned for many years, proudly frowned upon the thousands of Media and Persia, who, hitherto in vain, were endeavouring its overthrow.

Belshazzar, *while he tasted the wine, commanded the golden vessels*, taken from the house of God in Jerusalem, to be brought to him. With polluted lips, *he, his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank, from the sacred relics of Zion's former greatness, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.* A brilliant candlestick, with its many lights, the rays of which were reflected from innumerable mirrors, is suspended from the ceiling; and all within the palace is mirth and song. But, at once, the king of Babylon trembles. The paleness of death sat upon his countenance. The joints of his loins were loosed; and his knees smote one against another. The whole assembly fell into disorder. There was a cause. Fingers, unconnected with mortal hand, appear on the wall over against the candlestick, and there, in writing, they leave the indelible sentence which Daniel the

prophet was summoned to interpret—MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. *He hath numbered, he hath numbered, he hath weighed, they divide.* The King of heaven hath numbered the days of Chaldean power—He hath numbered them completely—The Judge of the earth hath weighed in the scale of moral estimation, this government—The Medes and Persians divide and destroy the empire.

That night the interpretation was verified. The Medes and Persians took the city, and massacred its nobles. The sun of Babylon set to rise no more. It is now but a tale that is told. *Sic transit gloria mundi.* Human power is evanescent ; *but the word of the Lord endureth for ever.* The hand-writing upon the wall shall not be forgotten : the words are copied into our bibles : they shall be repeated over all the kingdoms of the nations, unto people of every kindred and tongue : and the maxims which they lay down, shall, in their full import, be applied to other times.

TEKEL, *Thou art weighed in the balances.*

The same balances still remain in the hand of the Judge of the universe—Nations still exist—and the ministers of religion, like the prophet of God, still interpret the divine will.

Acting upon this authority, I proceed, to weigh, before your eyes, in the balance of the sanctuary,
THE BRITISH MONARCHY AND THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC.

To each, in its turn, I say TEKEL. In the estimate, which I make, of the moral character of each of these belligerents, I desire to exercise the impartiality of a visitant from another world. Of those things which are essential to the formation of a correct judgment, I would, designedly,

“ Keep nothing back,

“ Nor aught set down in malice.”

Seeing it is not as a statesman, a historian, or a philosopher, but as a christian divine, and with a view to particular practical questions, I am now bound to exhibit their character, it will not be expected that I should describe the state of literature in the two countries; that I should attend to their attainments in the sciences or the useful arts; that I should give an account of their respective means and strength; that I should enter into a detail of the domestic economy or general manners of the people; or, that I should describe the state of the churches, and the spirit of their public laws, otherwise, than as essentially necessary to an estimate of the comparative goodness of the two governments which are opposed in war.

The controversy, to be decided by the sword, is in fact between the two governments, although upon questions immediately affecting the members of each community. Independently, however, of the merits of the *cause*, for which war is waged, it is interesting for the christian to understand the charac-

ter of the *parties* in the contest. By contemplating these, in the light of the divine law, we shall be able to determine which has the least degree of the divine disapprobation, and to which, of course, the affections of the friends of God should most forcibly tend. There is a sense in which christians are not numbered among the nations. As members of Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world, as subjects to the Sovereign Governor of all nations, they are not to be influenced by partiality to country, so much as by correct views of the righteousness or iniquity which may belong to the constitutions of national power.

The constitutions of government as reduced to practice, are, in this case, the proper objects of examination. To these, as it respects the two belligerents, I now direct your attention, while I place them in the balances in the name of the Judge of the world.

I begin at home, with,

I. *The national government of the United States.*

The sin of a nation is the aggregate of all the transgressions committed by individuals in that nation: but these are properly *national sins*, which are notorious, prevalent, and characteristic. I speak not, however, of the nation at large, but of its constituted authorities, and therefore attend only to AUTHORIZED SINS.*

* The following remarks, made upon the British nation, by a very amiable and pious divine of the church of England, apply equal-

The public immoralities of the constitution of our federal government, may, although more numerous in detail, be classed under two heads, viz. *Disrespect for God—and violation of human liberty*. By the terms of the national compact, God is not at all acknowledged, and holding men in slavery is authorized. Both these are evils.

1. *God is not acknowledged by the constitution.* In a federative government, erected over several distinct and independent states, retaining each the power of local legislation, it is not to be expected that specific provision should be made for the interests of religion in particular congregations. The general government is erected for the general good of the United States, and especially for the management of their foreign concerns : but no association of men for moral purposes can be justified in an entire

ly to this country. “ The multiplicity of oaths which are interwoven into almost every branch of public business, involves thousands in the habitual guilt of perjury, which perhaps may eminently be styled *our* national sin. The frequency of oaths, the irreverent manner in which they are administered, and the impunity with which they are broken, have greatly contributed to weaken the sense of every moral obligation, and to spread a desolate and daring spirit through the land. The profanation of the Lord’s day, drunkenness, profane swearing, are contrary, not only to the precept of scripture, but to the laws of the land ; and yet could hardly be more prevalent if there were no statutes in force against them. Very few magistrates are concerned to enforce the observation of these laws ; and, if private persons sometimes attempt it by information, they meet but little success ; they obtain but little thanks. The acts of pleading, the minutæ and niceties of forms, are employed to entangle or discourage *them*, and to skreen offenders.

Newton’s Works, Phil. 1792. Vol. V. page 306.

neglect of the Sovereign of the world. Statesmen in this country had undoubtedly in their eye the abuse of religion for mere political purposes, which in the nations of the old world, had corrupted the sanctuary, and laid the foundation for the persecution of godly men. The principal writers, upon government, friendly to the cause of civil liberty in the kingdoms of Europe, had generally advocated principles, which, in their application, have led, upon the part of civilians, to a disrespect for religion itself; and these principles had no small influence upon the founders of this republic. This was the case in a remarkable degree with the continental politicians; nor are Sydney and Locke to be entirely exempted from the charge. In the overthrow of those particular establishments, favourable to the church of England, which existed here before the revolution, it was natural, considering the state of religious information in the community, to go to an opposite extreme. But no consideration will justify the framers of the federal constitution, and the administration of the government, in withholding a recognition of *the Lord and his Anointed* from the grand charter of the nation. On our daily bread, we ask a blessing. At our ordinary meals, we acknowledge the Lord of the world. We begin our last testament for disposing of worldly estates, in the name of God: and shall we be guiltless, with the bible in our hands, to disclaim the christian religion as a body politic?*

* If it be true, as has been asserted, by men who had the opportunity of knowing the fact, that Benjamin Franklin proposed, in the convention, the introduction into the constitution, of an article

2. The constitution of our government recognizes the practice of *holding men*, without being convicted of any offence against society, in *perpetual slavery*.

This evil, prohibited by the divine law, Exod. xxi. 16. *And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death*,* is equally inconsistent with what is said, in the declaration of American independence, to be a self-evident truth. The words of that very valuable document, are as follow, "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; that, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." In direct opposition to these *self-evident* maxims, the constitution provided for the continuance of the *slave-trade* until the year 1808, and it still provides for the continuance of *slavery* in this *free* country. It even gives to the slave-holder an influence, in le-

professing submission to the Lord, and that he was overruled, the sin and the reproach on the part of his opponents is the greater. It is certainly true, that an administration, often said to be more friendly to christianity, than that which has recently existed, has disclaimed that religion in the following words: viz. "*The government of the United States is not, in any sense, founded on the christian religion. It has, in itself, no character of enmity against the laws or religion of Mussulmen.*"

Tripol. Treaty, Art. 11. U. S. Laws, Vol. IV.

This treaty, ratified in the year 1797, was thereby made the supreme law of the land. *Const. Art. 6. Sect. 2.*

* The author published a discourse on this text, in 1802.

gislation, proportioned to the number of his fellow-men he holds in bondage.*

For these national immoralities, I am bound, as a minister of the gospel, who derives his politics from the bible,† to pronounce upon this government the sentence of my text,—TEKEL, *Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.*

Let me not be understood, however, as conveying the idea, that the other belligerent is not faulty in these respects. Great Britain set the example to her colonies, of prosecuting the slave-trade. She still retains in her numerous provinces, thousands in abject bondage. A few good men, after the repeated, the continual exertion of years in the British Parliament, obtained at last a victory honourable to themselves and to the cause of humanity, in finally

* The Constitution of the United States declares, Art. I. Sect. 9. Clause 1. The migration, *or importation* of such persons, as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the congress, prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight. Art. I. Sect. 2. Clause 3. *Representatives*, and direct taxes, shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of *free persons*—three fifths of all *other persons*.

† “*The bible is my system of politics.* There I read, that the Lord reigns; that he doth what he pleaseth in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; that no wisdom, understanding, counsel, or power, can prevail without his blessing; that, as righteousness exalteth a nation, so sin is the reproach, and will even totally be the ruin, of any people.”

Newton.

abolishing the African trade ; but those injured people, already in durance, have no hope of release for themselves or for their offspring. Slavery is a black, a vile inheritance left to America by her royal step-mother, whose injustice produced the Revolution.

On the score of religion, it is better to *neglect*, than to *prostitute* the church of God. *Here*, the framers of our law have said to the daughter of Zion, “ depart from our counsels. A few of us love thy cause ; but there are some who hate it ; and the greater part are indifferent about thee. Go, seek thy way uninterrupted through the land. Thou art free to pursue the most desirable course : but upon our aid thou must not calculate.” *There*, political men beheld the christian cause with an eye that seeks to make gain of every object within its reach. The statesman said, “ Come, daughter of Zion, thou must bear my yoke ; thou must be my servant ; thou must promote my interest ; and shouldest thou refuse my mandates, thou shalt suffer for thy fidelity to Jehovah. Whatever the bible may teach, it is my business to establish such a system of religion as best suits my own political plans. This is my determination.”

Notwithstanding, therefore, the irreligion of the general constitution of our government, the church of God is, in this country, upon a better footing, as it respects the national power, than in any other country upon earth. Nay, under existing circumstances, it is our mercy, that God has so ordered it in his providence,

that men, of the description of those who are elected to power among the nations, have not been permitted to interfere with ecclesiastical polity, and to exercise sovereignty over the consciences of men, in their spiritual concerns. While we reprobate the infidelity of the national compact, we rejoice in the measure of religious liberty which we enjoy; and we deprecate any attempts upon the part of political men, who do not understand the doctrines and the order of the christian church, to imitate the corrupt example of *Uzzah* the son of *Abinadab*, who applied his hand to the ark of the covenant, or of kings *Saul* and *Azariah*, who, without authority, offered sacrifice and burned incense before the Lord, and were accordingly punished as guilty.*

II. I now proceed to examine *The moral character of the British Constitution.*

It is not my design, in this examination, to give the history of this system of government, the foundation of which is to be found in the rude and barbarous institutions of the ancient Germans,† or to delineate its several checks and balances, in the distribution of power, according to its present practice. However instructive to the civilian such a review, it would not comport with the place in which I speak, or with the object which I contemplate. Upon its

* 1 Sam. xiii. 10—13. 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—21.

† STUART'S Hist. Diss. concerning the English Constitution.

wisdom and its might, its stability and its grandeur, let others freely and fully descant : it is my business to place it in the balances, in order to ascertain its moral worth before my God and his church. TEKEL ; *He hath weighed it.* And by *his* word *we* determine its character.

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT, as it now exists, is a *despotic usurpation—A superstitious combination of civil and ecclesiastical power—A branch of the grand antichristian apostacy—Erastian in its constitution and administration—and Cruel in its policy.* It is, therefore, a throne of iniquity, of which neither God, nor godly men, who understand it, can approve.* This is a heavy charge ; but it is not unjust : if I do not support every article of it with sufficient documentary testimony, it is not because I have not abundance of this at my command. I lay some of the evidence before you. The impartial will say it is enough. There is no need of comment. It is selected from unquestionable authorities, or in itself notorious.

1. *The British government, in the present practice of the constitution, is not a fair representation of the people over whom its power is exercised.*

There are only three ways by which one set of men acquire power over others—By divine authority, by the election of the people to be governed, or by usurpation. Usurped authority, maintained as well as

* Psalm xciv. 20.

originally acquired by force, is immoral. Divine right cannot be pleaded without a divine revelation to support it; it follows of course that the choice of the subject is necessary in the constitution of civil order, to confer legitimate authority upon the ruler. "The blood royal," "the ancient sovereigns," "the rights of the crown," "the throne of his ancestors," are all fine and captivating expressions from the lips of an orator, to amuse and deceive the thoughtless: but have they any meaning? Do they convey any idea worthy of a man of sense and magnanimity? Have they any allurements for a good christian? No. They are only dazzling ornaments without solidity and without worth. I lay it down as an axiom in political morality, that TRUE REPRESENTATION IS ESSENTIAL TO LAWFUL POWER; and that in all cases in which the Deity does not immediately interpose to appoint the depositaries of power, the choice of a representative belongs to the members of the community. Divide power as you will; make the arm of authority weak or strong, as suits your purpose; call your chief magistrate King, Consul, Emperor, President, Governor, or whatsoever else you please; form your legislative councils of one or of many chambers; let your courts, your judges, your officers of law, be many or few: but maintain the principle of representation inviolate; for a REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY IS THE ORDINANCE OF GOD.

The representative system is supported by the *authority of common sense—by decisions of scripture—by the general voice of the nations of the earth.*

First. Men, with common sense as their guide, in all the voluntary associations which they form, act upon this principle.

They appoint their chairman, their scribe, their treasurer, their managers, their committees, at pleasure. In all free cities ; in all benevolent institutions, whether composed of males or females ; in all meetings for the diffusion of literary knowledge, for hilarity, or for business, this is the common course of procedure : and why deny the application of common sense to national associations for the maintenance of order under municipal law, and the defence of the state from foreign violence ?

Second. Divine revelation inculcates and exemplifies the system of representation.

God deals with us, upon a knowledge of the frame of our minds and the character of our faculties ; and he directs us, so, also, to deal with one another. The representative system appears in *the two great establishments of heaven*, in relation to mankind,—the COVENANT OF WORKS and the COVENANT OF GRACE. *There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man, Adam, was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. The first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second man is the Lord from heaven. And as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy ; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.**

* 1 Cor. xv. 44—48.

In the administrations of divine grace, as well as in the formation of his covenant, Jehovah directs human society by his holy word to act upon the principle of representation; and he guarantees, by divine right, to that part of the rational family, who are peculiarly under his care, a system of social order corresponding therewith. Although he *appoints* ecclesiastical officers, he gives the *right of choice* to the people over whom they rule. In the exercise of authority, ecclesiastical officers meet, and appoint their own order and agents. In the government divinely provided for the church of God, we have the best evidence of the manner in which he will have his rational creatures to act, in the formation of all their social institutions. The church is by divine right a Republic: such a system of government is of course the wisest and the best.

In civil affairs, as well as in ecclesiastical, the same principles of order are inculcated in Scripture. The law for the election of rulers, and for trial of their conduct, implies the right of election, and removal from office. The practice illustrates the law. We read, it is true, of kings, and of kings designated to office by immediate revelation. But the executive officers of Judah and Israel, although called kings, were placed under a law, and liable to deposition on account of mal-administration. These kings, even when nominated by the Lord, were still recognized as the representatives, or agents of the commonwealth, and subject to removal from office by the community whensoever they abused their trust. The

covenant of God with David, I admit, did authorize the regal succession in the family of the son of Jesse ; but that succession was never regulated by primogeniture, so much as by actual qualification for power. And it would be as absurd, now that Messiah is come, to whom that arrangement pointed, to plead in behalf of royal blood, as to require, after the example of the house of Aaron, that the ministry of the church should be subjected to hereditary succession.

Abimelech is the first king of whom we read among the Israelites, and he was made so by the *men of Shechem*.* The *men of Israel* had offered the sovereignty to Gideon ; but, while he admitted their power of making the election, he refused their offer.† When Saul was placed upon the throne, the institution of the monarchy, and the actual election of the incumbent, were the acts of the people of Israel, although the Lord pointed out the man.‡ David, Solomon, and Rehoboam, Uzziah and Josiah, received the kingdom by consent of the community. All the kings of Israel and Judah were subject to the constitution and the law ; obliged to act with the advice of the *Sanhedrim*, the great council of elders ; to preserve, in their rights, the lesser Sanhedrims of the several cities, all of which were regularly elected to office ; and in default, these kings were punished of the Lord, by divine judgments, and of the people

* Judges ix. † Judg. viii. 21—23. ‡ 1 Sam. xii. 12—20.
Hos. xiii. 10.

by deposition, as in the case of Uzziah, or by death, as in that of his father Amaziah, king of Judah.*

* The celebrated Mr. *Prynne*, who valiantly contended in the British parliament for religion and liberty, under the reign of Charles I. and who vindicated, with his pen, the rights of the people upon scriptural principles, treats at great length upon this subject. After a learned and full examination of the history of the kings of Judah and Israel, he adds, "From all these texts, compared with Prov. xi. 14. & xv. 22. & xxv. 5. it is most apparent, that they were no *absolute sovereign princes*, paramount to their whole kingdoms, or the general senate or congregation of the people, or their *sanhedrim*; but *inferior to them in power*; and not only counselled, but overruled usually, by them, in all matters of public concernment." *Sov. Power of Parl.* p. 141.

Zuinglius, the first herald of the reformation, says, that "the people of Israel, although they called a king, *reserved to themselves sufficient authority* to overrule their king in those things which seemed needful for the public welfare. The kings of the Jews, and others, might be lawfully *deposed* by the people. If the king be created by common suffrages, he may again be deprived by common votes, unless they will be punished with him." *Tom. I. Art. 42. quoted by Prynne.*

The learned *Stephanus J. Brutus*, in his *Vendicatio contra tyrannos*, in answer to Machiavel, writes, "As all the people are superior to the king, so are those officers of state who *represent* them collectively considered. In the kingdom of Israel they had elders and captains elected out of all the tribes, who had the care of the commonwealth, both in peace and in war—neither could any thing be determined without their advice, which much concerned the commonwealth. And because they represented all the people, all the people are then said to have assembled together." *Quest. 3. p. 91—97.*

Sigonius is the last writer I shall quote, in this connexion. "The kings of the Israelites were *created by the suffrages of the people*—although the kingdom of Judah was in a sense hereditary, yet it was confirmed by the suffrages of the people." *Rep. Heb. Lib. 7. Cap. 3.*

In the third place, The general practice of nations, even where monarchy existed, is in support of the principle of representation. Kingly government is obviously, as the learned Selden, a member of the Westminster Assembly, calls it, a *heathen institution* ; but the king was considered as the agent of the public will. The history of every nation will serve to show, that I do not make the assertion without authority. The greatest tyrants have been in the habit of considering themselves as representing the nation over which they ruled ; and in the present age, the high claims of arbitrary power tend, only, like the fables of Pagan mythology, and the fairy tales of a ruder superstition, to decorate, with splendid imagery, poetry and romance ; or, when introduced artfully, into popular declamation, to flatter aspiring minds, and deceive the simple. The treaty of Paris abundantly shows that crowned heads no longer depend on the divine right of hereditary succession. Ferdinand is recognized, during the life-time of his deposed father, on the throne of Spain. Murat and Bernadotte are permitted to occupy the kingdoms of living fugitives of the blood royal ; and since the partition of Poland, successful usurpation is a better title than carnal descent. If the principle of representation is forgotten, hereditary right is less depended on, than possession by force of arms. Such, alas ! is the unprincipled condition of the masters of the European world.*

* That the representative system, in a greater or less degree, met with the views of the several nations, is obvious from the works of the ablest writers. *Andrew Horne*, an eminent English

If I have succeeded in showing, that representation is essential to lawful rule, I shall take less of your time in proving, that the PRACTICE of the British constitution is, when weighed in this balance, found wanting.

lawyer in the reign of Edward I. says, “ A king is *created* and *elected* to do justice, that the first kings of England had thirty-eight companions, *comites*, or COUNTS, the first officers of so many counties, who collectively representing the whole kingdom, were above the king.”

Chancellor Fortescue, in a work addressed to Henry VI. describes the kingdom as a body politic, of which the king is head, and the public will the heart or seat of life. “ The king cannot change the laws of that body, or withdraw their substance from them against their wills. He is ordained for the defence of the laws. He receiveth power from his people. Of their own free will they submitted to the government of a king, only to the end that they might thereby maintain themselves with more safety.” *De Laud. Reg. Cap. 9.*

Salamonius uses these words, “ The whole kingdom and people are the *original supreme sovereign power*, by whose common consent and authority, all lawful kings and kingdoms were at first created and instituted, and from whom they derived all their regal jurisdiction.” *Sal. de Principales, Lib. 1. p. 1—6.*

Grotius represents the people as originally, *sui juris*, entitled to dispose of the government as they shall think meet—“ it being a thing in its own nature not capable of an occupancy, nor seizable by any, unless the people will voluntarily desert their own liberty.” *De Jure. bel. and pac. l. 3. c. 15.*

“ Now verily, since kings are constituted by the people, all the people are better and greater than the king. He who receiveth authority from another is inferior to his author. In the republic, which is compared to a ship, the king is the captain, the people the owner. To him, holding the helm, the people submit, when notwithstanding he ought to be accounted *a servant*.” *Jun. Brut. Vindi. con. tyrran. quest. 3. p. 41.*

The *king*, it is admitted, *cannot* do wrong. He is not accountable. He succeeds to the throne according to primogeniture. Be he wise or simple; good or bad, by the constitution of that country, which has superior pretensions to good sense and to morality, the first-born of royal blood ascends the chair of state; and, without the least regard to capacity or to character, he is chief magistrate and head of the church. This is notorious. Such a monarch cannot be considered as the true representative of the kingdom. *The Lords spiritual and temporal*, have little of the principle stated above as necessary to lawful rule, and *the House of Commons* is far from being a true representation of the people.

The population of the united kingdoms amounts, according to the latest accounts, to about fifteen millions. Very few of these are represented in parliament. The whole of the members returned to that great court of the empire, have received, probably, less than three hundred thousand votes. These suffrages are commonly bought and sold as any other article in the market. The ministry can always secure a large majority. The parliament is a representation of a few powerful and opulent families; and these only serve to give the appearance of popularity to the paramount influence of the monarchy, as employed by the immediate servants of the crown.*

* The population of Great Britain and Ireland, is computed at fifteen millions. Of these, upwards of two are paupers. Upwards of one half the remainder is of the female sex. And of the males of mature years, which cannot be computed as far exceeding three

2. *The British constitution of government, is a superstitious combination of civil and ecclesiastical power.*

The king is head and sovereign of the church. The bishops of the church are lords of the land, and members of the legislature, and judges of the law. By order of both, the most solemn of the ordinances of the Lord our God is continually profaned: and all this is essential to the constitution of the government. These facts are notorious: and there is not upon the face of the earth greater iniquity.

The king is head of the church. “Our lawyers pronounce that the king of England unites in his person, the dignity of chief magistrate, with the sanctity of a priest; and the title of Sacred Majesty, appears to have commenced, when he assumed the

millions, one out of six is in the pay of government. The offices in church and state, in the army, the navy, and the colonies, are filled by not less than half a million of men, deriving from the patronage of the crown not less than one hundred millions of dollars a year. These have friends and connexions; and there are many office-hunters depending upon the patronage of the crown. The evil is of course enormous. Scarcely will one hundred thousand independent electors be found in the united kingdoms. In England there are only, altogether, one hundred and sixty thousand freeholders. *King's Tables.*

“What then,” I use the words of a distinguished patriot of the revolution, “What is the majority of their parliament, but a flagitious combination of ministerial hirelings, conspired to erect the Babel of despotism upon the ruins of the beautiful fabric of law.” *Gov. Livingston.*

function of head of the church.”* He, as sovereign of the ecclesiastical body, calls at pleasure *his* clergy together, and dissolves their meetings when they have executed *his* will: he fills up vacancies among his bishops; and he presents to their livings and their tithes over *his* subjects, the inferior clergy, unless the patronage be vested in subordinate hands. He, by his pontifical and royal sanction, confers the character of *truth* to his own faithful subjects upon *articles of faith*, whatever they may be in themselves: he confers upon *ceremonies*, however frivolous, the virtue of being *significant and edifying*: he constitutes a *government*, however arbitrary, *pure and apostolical*: in a word, he defends, he tolerates, he persecutes, according to the constitution of the establishment over which he presides with papal magnificence. And yet, O my God and my Redeemer, to such a *monarchy*, with all its impious usurpation of the rights of God, do any of thy disciples profess an attachment? Ah! how frail a thing is man!

Again, according to the British constitution, bishops of the church are, by virtue of their office, members of parliament and judges of the law. They are *Lords spiritual*, occupying a seat in the upper house of legislation; and the house of lords is the ultimate tribunal of justice. The privileges of the spiritual lords exceed those of the other peers of the realm. They hold courts of their own, of which they are the sole judges: they issue writs in a pecu-

* Pinkerton.

liar style, and in their own name : they alone can depute to others their authority ; and the judges of the king cannot sit within the diocese of some of them without the bishop's permission.* Such then, is this constitution, that while the king is supreme head of the church, the prelates of the church are an essential part of the legislature and judiciary of the empire.

Is this right ? Is this scriptural ? Is this agreeable to the example of our Lord—conformable to the spirit of religion—corresponding with apostolical example ? And is it thus, my hearers, that men would exemplify the doctrine, *my kingdom is not of this world* ! I, as a minister of Christ, have to reason with you in defence of the right of making a few political remarks ; and I cannot flatter myself that I have succeeded with you all, in procuring a patient hearing : and yet, *those ministers of religion*, who neglect the paths of the Lord, and are themselves become LORDS OF THE LAND, and of God's heritage, enjoy your sympathy : to that government you are attached, and, at me, you are displeased for examining its character. Bear with me, brethren, I would not wound your feelings unnecessarily. I even sympathize with you in your political obliquities. Man is frail. Even Abraham besought the Lord for Sodom ; and the Lord dealt tenderly with his servant, though he destroyed the cities of the plain. I ask of you but the liberty of saying to this part of the system of British power, *Tekel*—Thou art found wanting.

* Chamber, 63—63. Blackstone, b. 1. c. 11.

If more be necessary to justify me in this application of the text, it will be found in the *practice*, required by the combined and impious power of church and state over the British empire—the *administration* of the *sacramental test*.

What would you think of an ordinance from the congress of the United States, requiring all officers upon the civil and military list, under pain of dismissal, to take the sacrament? What would you say to a demand upon Presbyterians, and Independents, and Baptists, &c. to forego their own religious profession, and take the communion from Episcopal hands? What would you say of an act of congress that required the prostitution of the Lord's Supper, to the profane, and the ignorant, and the infidel? What would you say to me, if instead of thus addressing you, I should be so far disposed to make traffic of my ministry, as to accept of an appointment and an equipage, and sit with the *consecrated elements* at the door of the capitol, to administer the body and the blood of the Lord, to the whole tribe of office-hunters who dance attendance in the hall of power? Could you approve of this? would you tolerate me in it? would the rulers of our land require such a profanation? would this community bear it? would the ministers of the church submit to it? It is practised in England. It is the law of that land. It is authorized, it is demanded by the government. It is observed by the ministers. This prostitution is the door of admission to power.* *Shall I not visit for these things?*

* Stat. 25. Car. II. Cap. 2.

*saieth the Lord ; and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this ?**

3. *The British government is a branch of the general antichristian apostacy.*

The opposition to the great protestant doctrine in relation to antichrist, which the English commentators of more recent date have carried on, found its only support in the terror produced by the French revolution. Mr. Faber is, by far, the most plausible of those writers, who have represented that nation under the Emperor Napoleon, as the *last head*

* Mr. John Newton, a minister of the church of England, preached a sermon on this text in the parish church of St. Mary Woolnoth, Feb. 21, 1781, in which he spoke as follows: " *The Test and Corporation Acts*, which require every person who has a post under government, or a commission in the army or navy, to qualify himself for his office, by receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, would occasion no sin, if men were generally influenced by the fear of God, or even a principle of integrity. They would then rather decline places of honour or profit, than accept of them upon such terms. We frequently see *professed infidels, and notorious libertines, approach the Lord's Table as a matter of course*, and prostitute the most solemn ordinance of christianity to their ambition or interest. I am afraid we have been long guilty of a contemptuous profanation of the body and blood of Christ." *Vol. V. pp. 3, 5.*

" A man cannot be an exciseman, a custom-house officer, a lieutenant in the army or navy, no, *not so much as a tide-waiter*, without putting on the most distinguishing badge of christianity, according to the usage of the church of England. Is not this a strong temptation to profanation and hypocrisy ? Does it not pervert one of the most solemn institutions of religion ?" *Neal's Hist. Pur. Rel. II. p. 539.*

of the great apostacy ; and at whose downfall, by the judgments of the seventh vial, the Millennium was to commence. This system of interpretation is now exploded. The empire of Buonaparte is no more ; and yet the Millennium does not appear. The manners of men are as they were. Ignorance still prevails. Tyranny and superstition are sufficiently obvious. The church is in the wilderness ; and although the Bourbons are restored, Europe is unsettled ; and still antichrist reigns.

According to the unanimous opinion of all the protestant expositors, not excepting the English themselves, that country has once been one of the ten horns of the apocalyptical beast, influenced by Satan, the dragon.* This could not be disputed, because the land was geographically within the bounds of the Latin Roman empire ; and the people had submitted to the Latin Roman religion.

Some indeed allege, that, at the reformation, the connexion of Britain with the beast was dissolved ; but, the scripture prediction does not justify the expectation that any of the great powers of Europe should be severed from that connexion, for centuries, or even any considerable time, before the general destruction of the man of sin. The history of that country, the tyranny and superstition of Henry VIII ; the persecutions carried on against the saints, during the continuance of the succession in the Stuart race ; and the terrible bloodshed caused by

* Rev. xiii.

Charles II. and James, his successor and brother, both Popish tyrants, completely set aside the idea of England's ceasing to be a horn of the beast, before the revolution of 1688, under William of Holland. Nor does that event itself justify the supposition. Much was certainly gained by it to the cause of both religion and liberty. The tyranny of the throne, and the persecutions arising from it, were mitigated, but not abolished. If protestant blood does not flow as formerly, the saints, in that country, the successors of the martyrs, still labour under the frowns of power, marked by ecclesiastical and civil pains and disabilities.

No country, it appears from the prospective history afforded in prophecy, which was once in connexion with the beast, is to be perfectly separated from the great apostacy until the *seventh vial* shall have poured out its plagues. The *fifth* has shaken the connexion by the partial reformation of several nations ; but in no instance has the connexion been completely and permanently dissolved.

Prophecy excludes the idea, of considering the British empire as removed from the *Latin Earth* : and, the character of its *government*, as shown under the preceding articles, demonstrates its *antichristianism*. The English establishment is, itself, of a *beastly nature*. An unhallowed connexion between church and state, in which civil liberty suffers, and true religion is prostituted, can never be reconciled with that li-

berly wherewith Christ has made us free. It is an antichristian polity. I add to these a *third* argument, drawn from the consideration of recent events. The present king did take, as the condition of the crown of Corsica, an oath to support the Popish religion;* and he is at the head of the establishment of the same faith in the province of Lower Canada, in connexion with the church of England. By his arms, by the wealth of his empire, and by the blood of his subjects, he has proved the principal stay of the antichristian polity in Europe. The restoration of the Bourbons, of the Pope, and of the Inquisition, sufficiently show that he is in fact a pillar of the great throne of the man of sin. The British government, once a branch of the apostacy, still within the bounds of the symbolical earth, actually antichristian in its own character, and now the chief stay of the BEAST'S authority, must necessarily be considered as continuing to be one of the *ten kings or horns*, which agree to give their power to the great corruption of moral order in the world.

The guilt of a nation, or an individual, is in proportion to the privileges enjoyed, and the actual immorality. That country was the most favoured of the nations. None had attained to so much light and reformation. It was once, although only by compulsion on the part of the crown and the prelacy, in solemn league and covenant with God. It has

broken, like treacherous Judah, and backsliding Israel, its covenant ; it has shed, like Chaldea, the blood of the martyrs ; and, although persecution unto death hath ceased, this apostate nation still persists in the course of policy which the persecutor introduced—a course of opposition to true religion and regular ecclesiastical order. *Ye are the children of them that killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.** In applying the sacred measure to every branch of the apostacy, we cannot but pronounce it *wanting*.

4. *The British government is Erastian in its constitution and administration.*

The expression, *Erastian*, is not so well understood in this country, where the practice is happily in a great measure unknown, as in the European world, where it almost universally prevails. Certain systems, both of religion and of human science, are, sometimes, stamped with the names of distinguished men, who appear in their illustration and defence, although the principles themselves may have had a very different origin. The names of Calvin and Arminius, are attached to systems which existed since the introduction of christianity to the fallen world. We speak of the *Newtonian* Philosophy, of *Galvanism*, &c. because the laws of nature, ancient as creation itself, were illustrated in an able manner by men of such names. The phrase *Erastian* often occurs

* Math. xxiii. 31.

in the history of British controversies about religion and government.

Thomas Erastus was both a divine and physician. He was learned and active, and influential among the distinguished men of that very remarkable age in which he lived: an age, which roused by an extraordinary impulse, the human mind from the lethargy under which it had long laboured—the era of the reformation. Born in Baden of Switzerland, in the year 1624, and educated in Bazil and Bologna, he practised physic at the court of the elector Palatine, and became professor in the university of Heidelberg. In his book on *Excommunication*, he develops those principles which have since been called by his name. That Christ and his apostles prescribed no forms of discipline for the church—that the supreme ecclesiastical power belongs to the civil magistrate—that ministers are only teachers possessed of the right of public persuasion—that to the government of the state belongs the right of admitting members into the church, and excluding them from it—That the church of Christ is a department of the civil commonwealth, are the sentiments of Erastus. These have always been the prevailing sentiments of the court of Great Britain, since the time of Henry VIII. The clergy of the church of England, from *Cranmer* to *Whitgift*,* were of Eras-

* “ *Bishop Warburton* informs us, from *Selden de Synedrüs*, that Erastus’s famous book *de excommunicatione* was purchased by Whitgift, of Erastus’s widow in Germany, and put by him to the press in London, under fictitious names of both the place and the printer.” *Supplemental Vol. Warburt. Works*, p. 473.

tian principles. *Bancroft* was the first to maintain the divine right of the episcopacy; and even since his day, the great body of the English hierarchy view the church “*as a mere creature of the state.*”^{*} Indeed, the Puritans themselves, both the ministers and the members of Parliament, were willing at first to subscribe, with but little variation, to Erastian sentiments, although disposed to a greater degree of liberty, in religion and civil concerns, than was consistent with the pleasure of the court and the bishops.[†] It was not, until the Scottish commissioners explained, in the Assembly of Divines, the true polity of the church of God, as a *spiritual empire*, having its own officers and laws, *under THE HEAD JESUS CHRIST*, that the English ministers fully understood the distinction.[‡] To the faithful labours of the

^{*} These are the words of *Ncal*, in his history of the Puritans, who also confirms the remarks I have made. *Vol. I. p. 510.*

[†] This was the substance of the petition signed by seven hundred ministers in the year 1641. The parliament were of the same mind, and claimed the power of reforming the church as an inherent right.

[‡] In that venerable Assembly of Divines, which compiled our admirable Confession of Faith and other ecclesiastical standards, the very learned *Selden* had a seat. He, assisted by the counsel, and the rabbinical learning of *Coleman* and *Lightfoot*, and supported by the national feelings, and the prejudices or opinions of the parliament, argued the cause of *Erastianism* in the GRAND DEBATE upon ecclesiastical order. The question excited immense interest; the whole church, a great nation, awaited the result with anxiety.

George Gillespie, one of the ministers of *Edinburgh*, and a commissioner to the Assembly from the church of Scotland, was observed to be engaged occasionally with his pen, while *Selden* spoke. It was supposed he was taking notes of the argument. He, too,

church of Scotland, the christian world is indebted, under the blessing of God, for the prevalence of a

was learned, and of great reading; but he was young, pious, modest, and a stranger in London. He had not acquired celebrity. Some of the most grave and pious divines had a previous opportunity of satisfying themselves as to his views of divine truth. They knew the sentiments of the church which he represented, to be *anti-cras-tian*. They went to his chair, and requested him to speak. They inquired if he had taken notes. He was silent. They saw the paper on which he had written. The only words upon it were, GIVE LIGHT, LORD, AND DIRECTION. These were often repeated. "Rise, George," said a venerable friend, "Rise and defend your principles, your country, your church, and the kingdom of your God—Rise up, man, and defend the right of the Lord Jesus Christ to govern, by his own laws, the church which he purchased with his blood. Mr. Gillespie complied. He began by giving a summary of the argument of his learned antagonist, distinguishing the several principles which it involved, and then requested to be corrected if he made an unfair statement. Selden replied, if Mr. Gillespie will refute these principles with the same accuracy with which he has stated them, the controversy is over. Mr. Gillespie had in his hand a two-edged sword. He contended successfully for the prerogatives of his Redeemer's crown, and the independency of Christ's kingdom. He triumphed. Mr. Selden himself observed, with astonishment, "This young man by his speech has swept away the learning and labour of my life." Erastianism was condemned, and presbytery established by the Westminster Assembly.

The parliament was unwilling to yield. There, Mr. Selden had also a seat. His hand was seen in the scruples and delays employed in the House of Commons against the establishment of the presbyterian regimen. The Scottish commissioners remonstrated. The London ministers also petitioned. Commissioners from parliament met with a committee of the Assembly; but to the exertions of Mr. Henderson, another of the Scottish commissioners; supported by the voice of Scotland, and the fear of losing the co-operation of the Scottish army in the war against the royalists, the reluctant acquiescence of the English Parliament is to be ascribed.

principle, now universally understood, and, in this country, reduced to practice by all ecclesiastical bodies—that *the church is a distinct society, with an organization of its own*. This important doctrine is of divine authority. Its truth hath been attested by the blood of the martyrs: and the kingdoms, which oppose this part of the faith delivered to the saints, are guilty of rebellion against *the King of kings, and Lord of lords*.

The *Erastianism* of the present British constitution of government, will now be made apparent.

The civil government makes the established church, with the king as its supreme head, an essential part of the national polity—It settles, by Parliamentary law, the condition of ministerial fellowship—It determines the faith to be professed—It prescribes forms of prayer to be offered from the pulpit—It inflicts the severest censures of the church—and exercises, exclusively, the power of convoking the superior judicatories. Read, for yourselves, the references which I make, and then decide upon the accuracy of this statement.

The church, under the *headship* of the reigning prince, whether male or female, it matters not, is, in fact, a department of the state.

The British monarch has assumed all that power in his dominions “over all persons and all causes, whether civil or ecclesiastic,” which the Pope claim-

ed; and the Parliament have secured by statute this prerogative of the crown. The declaration of George I. who styles himself *Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church in his dominions*, proceeding upon this principle, requires that *the clergy, before they can settle any differences about the external polity of the church, must first obtain leave under his broad seal.**

It is provided by the treaty of union between England and Scotland, that the church of England, with all the civil power given into the hands of the prelaty, shall be preserved entire, and this is *declared to be an essential fundamental part of the union*. The temporal power of the lords spiritual, the spiritual supremacy of the monarch, together with the prostitution of the most distinguishing badge of christian profession in the sacramental test, prove beyond a doubt that the church and state are combined into one great corrupt and impious system of misrule: and justifies the charge of Erastianism against the British Constitution.

In the *Act for an union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland*, provision is made for rendering the *English hierarchy perpetual*: and the church of Scotland, although in form Presbyterian, has been constrained to submit to Erastianism, not merely by her members supporting the English religious establishment; but also, as essential to their own. The

Scottish establishment is itself *Erastian*. The civil power SETTLES the condition of ministerial fellowship in the church. At the revolution, king William addressed *letters patent* to both the Presbyterian and Episcopalian clergy, determining the conditions upon which they must join together. In the letter of February 1690, addressed to the General Assembly, his Majesty says to the highest judicatory of the the church, “ *We have thought good to signify our pleasure to you, that you make no distinction of men, otherwise well qualified for the ministry, who are willing to join with you in the acknowledgment of, and submission to the government of church and state, as it is by law now established, though they have formerly complied to the introducing of episcopacy; and that ye give them no disturbance upon that head.*”

In the letter of the 15th June thereafter, it is ordained, “ That neither the Assembly, nor any commission or church meeting, do *meddle in any process or business that may concern the purging out of episcopal ministers.*”

In the letter of January 1692, to the episcopal clergy, the language is equally dictatorial. “ We doubt not of your applying to, and heartily meeting and concurring with your brethren, the Presbyterian ministers, in the TERMS WHICH WE HAVE BEEN AT PAINS TO ADJUST for you.”

It is provided, too, by act of parliament, “ *That none be admitted or continued ministers, who do not*

take the oaths thereby prescribed, and observe uniformity of worship, &c. as the same are, or *shall be allowed* by authority of parliament.”*

The civil power determines, of its own accord, the *rule of faith* to be professed by those ministers who are thus *admitted or continued*, and for the whole church in which they serve. Without ever calling an Assembly, and without any reference to former ecclesiastical acts, the parliament read and voted the Westminster Confession of Faith as the public confession of both church and nation.†

The king and parliament, no doubt, with the aid of the *Lords spiritual*, have provided for all the clergy of the Presbyterian establishment, the *form* of prayer to be used for the king and the royal family ; and it must be used under pain of exclusion from the ministry of the church.‡ Nor is this the only case in which the civil power assumes the right of deposing ministers from the pastoral charge, however well they may be received by their people, and however great the attachment between them and their flocks. Ministers who did not appear before a certain day prescribed by the act,§ “are hereby, *ipso facto*, deprived of their respective kirks and stipends, and the same declared vacant without any further sentence.” Under a similar penalty, queen Anne enforced the oath of abjuration. George I.

* William and Mary, Par. 1. Sess. 4. Act 23. † Par. 1690.

‡ 1695, Act 23. 1700, Act 2. and 1706, Act 6.

§ Act 27. Sess. 5. Parl. 1. William and Mary.

extended the requisition to students on trial, to schoolmasters, and to all *masters* in the universities.* George II. required an act† relative to a certain Capt. Porteus, to be read from all the pulpits in Scotland, once on every Lord's day for a whole year, "and in case," the act of parliament says, "such minister shall neglect to read this act, he shall for the first offence be declared incapable of sitting or voting in any church judicatory; and for the second offence, be declared incapable of taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefice."

The exercise of Erastian supremacy extends to the settlement of ministers in a congregation. It is not there, as in this country. The people do not elect their own pastor. The appointment is vested originally in the crown, although usually transferred into a few of the most noble and wealthy in the land. The *patron* gives the church to his friend; and if the people make any opposition, a company of armed men induct the pastor into office. "The Pope," said a distinguished lawyer, "claimed the right of the patronage of every kirk, to which no third party could show a special title; but since the reformation, the crown, as coming in place of the Pope, is considered as universal patron, where no right of patronage appears in a subject."‡

I have only further to observe, that the king summons at his pleasure, the supreme judicatories of the

* Act 6. 1706. † Act 1737.

‡ Erskine's Prin. Law of Scot. Book I. Tit. 5.

church; adjourns and dissolves them as much as the civil legislature. In ordinary cases, they who compose the General Assembly, are sufficiently obsequious, and are of course permitted to meet and depart at a certain season of the year without compulsion: but instances have repeatedly occurred, when the fact was otherwise, and the uniform tenor of the commission under which they meet, maintains the *supremacy* of the crown.*

I dismiss this disagreeable subject, with a quotation from the public records of two respectable bodies of professed christians in the British empire. From their words you will immediately perceive, that while I am describing the Erastianism of the constitution of government, I speak the language, not of an individual, but of churches, even in that country.

I begin with the *judicial declaration* of THE SECESSION CHURCH.

“ It is peculiarly incumbent upon every civil state whereunto christianity is introduced, to study and bring to pass, *that civil government among them*, in all the appurtenances of its constitution and administration, *run in an agreeableness to the word of God*; be subservient unto the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, and to the interests of the true religion. By the good hand of God, the estates of *England*, but

* The style is, “ *Thus seeing by our decree, an Assembly is to meet, &c.*”

more especially of *Scotland*, were inspired with a noble and predominant zeal for the house of God, in all its valuable institutions: and attained to a considerable pitch of *civil reformation* subservient to the same. It is observable that in *Scotland*, the reformation of the church hath always, in a beautiful order, *preceded and introduced* the reformation of the state.”

“It was not long, till this beautiful work was smothered, by the woful apostacy at, and after, the restoration of king Charles II.”

“The fatal overthrow of the former civil reformation; the devastation of the house and heritage of God; the unparalleled course of perjury, treachery, tyranny, against the King, cause, and subjects of Zion, and against the *liberties of mankind*; are laid open in the act and testimony. It is to be feared, the guilt thereof is still lying upon the *throne, the body politic*, and all ranks in these lands.”

“Thus our ancient civil reformation has been *apostatized* from, and grievously defaced—great guilt and wrath from the Lord is still lying and increasing upon the body politic. Moreover, as our *civil settlement* has been thus corrupted, so it hath natively issued in a course of defective and *corrupt administrations*. All the legal securities given to this church, from 1638 to 1650, were overlooked; such were retained in places of public trust, and in military office, as were enemies to our reformation, and had been deeply involved in the horrid defec-

tion, *persecution, and bloodshed* of the former period. The power and privileges of the church were encroached upon, as indeed by the act 1592, according to which presbytery was settled at the revolution, the *Assembly* is deprived of power, where the king or his commissioner are present, to nominate and appoint time and place for their next meeting."

A very sinful and sad encroachment was made upon the costly and valuable privileges of the Lord's people, and a door opened for the corruption of the church, and the ruin of souls, while the right of *patronages*, which had been abolished in the year 1649, was again restored. This kingdom hath become subject to a parliament, whereof the bishops of England are constituent members; and an attempt is made to force the members of this church unto an approbation of the English hierarchy. A bold and fatal encroachment was made, 1737, upon the headship of Zion's King, by that *Erastian* agent Capt. John Porteus.* By the above-mentioned apostacy and corruption in *the settlement and administration of the present civil government*, the measure of guilt upon the body politic, and their

* This man commanded the town-guard of Edinburgh. *Piqued* at the populace, he ordered his men to fire upon them, and killed and wounded many. He was tried and condemned by the civil authority, to suffer death as a murderer. He was a base man. The king reprieved him. The people took him from prison and gave him a public execution. Every minister was commanded to read from the pulpit, a declaration of parliament upon this subject, offering a reward for a discovery of any one concerned in the deed. Not one was ever discovered. Scotland had no informers.

Legislators is greatly filled up." These quotations are from GIBS. *DISPLAY OF THE SEC. TEST.* Vol. I. p. 230—289. They speak the language of all *Seceders*, whether in *Europe* or *America*. Indeed, as to the *moral* character of the constitution of government in that country, there has not been much diversity of opinion among pious men who understand it. All admit its impiety.

The following quotation shows the light in which the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*, in the British dominions, view the national government.

"When *Henry VIII.* of England, cast off the authority of the *See of Rome*, he did, at the same time, assume to himself all that power in his dominions, which the Pope formerly claimed; and soon afterwards procured to have himself acknowledged and declared by act of parliament, to be HEAD OF THE CHURCH. This *Antichristian Supremacy* has ever since continued an essential part of the English constitution, and inherent right of the crown. The *British* monarch confines not his spiritual supremacy to the church of *England*, but extends it also over the church of Scotland."*

"In the revolution of 1688, the *settlement of religion* is not a religious, but a mere civil and *political* one. It appears quite inconsistent with the revolution settlement, to consider church power in any other light, than as subordinate to the power of the state.† We

* Act. Dec. and Test. 1797. p. 76. † Idem. p. 60—62.

have the idolatrous institutions of Prelacy, established in the one nation; and Erastianism, under the specious pretext of Presbytery, in the other: and both under an exotic head of ecclesiastical government. As the *Constitutions*, of both church and state, were *Erastian* and antiscritptural; so their conduct ever since has been agreeable thereto; tending evidently to discover that, while the *state is robbing our Redeemer of his crown, and his church of her liberties*, the church, instead of testifying against, gives consent to these impieties.* It would be endless to attempt an enumeration of all the instances of the exercise of Erastianism, which is annually renewed. How often, alas! have the Assemblies been prorogued, raised, and dissolved, by magistratical authority, and sometimes without nomination of another diet! how frequently, also, have they been restricted in their proceedings, and prelimited as to members, and matters to be treated of and discussed therein; depriving some members of their liberty to sit and act as members, though regularly chosen! all which exercise of Erastian supremacy natively results from the parliamentary settlement.”†

6. If the congress of the United States, in the year 1776, were correct in ascribing CRUELTY to the *policy of the British government*, it is easy to show the continuance of the same disposition until the present day.

* P. 63.

† P. 64.

In the Declaration of Independence, the Fathers of American liberty assert, that “ the history of the present king of Great Britain, is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. He is at this time, transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries, to complete the work of death, desolation, and tyranny, already begun, with circumstances *of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.* He has constrained our fellow-citizens, taken captive on the high seas, to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands. He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.”*

England is secure in her vast possessions in Asia ; and such is the frame of government for her territories in the East, as rarely to admit of discussion, either in the parliament or in her newspapers. Therefore popular feeling is never excited about the operations of peace and war in that country, as it is about the several events which come to pass in the kingdoms of Europe. Among *the princes of Hindostan*, Great Britain has rioted for half a century,

* Dec. Am. Independence.

with a policy most cruel and perfidious, without provoking discussion, or commanding general attention, either in England or America. There, under the plausible plea, which tyranny never fails to employ, of *granting protection for territory* to the weaker states, the British power has effected more revolutions in the course of a few years, than have been effected in Europe since the troubles in France commenced. The native sovereignties of India have been deceived, divided, and conquered: and their only recompense for the power and the territory which they surrendered, consists in the loss of their liberty and independence.

The usurpations, and the rapacity, and cruelty ascribed to the late Emperor of France, are exceeded in degree and permanence by the British government of India. In a political point of view, the miseries of Asia are not immediately interesting; but in the estimate of moral character, the remoteness from us of the scene of action, must not prevent our taking these enormities into the account. In relation to them, the most abject flatterers of British greatness have no apology to offer. These are not *defensive wars*. They are the offspring of the lust of power and of wealth. None of the *Nabobs of the Carnatic or of Oude*; neither *Timur*, the hero of Paniput, nor *Tippoo Sultan*, nor *the Great Mogul*, ever threatened an invasion of the islands of Britain and Ireland. “To interfere actively in the domestic affairs of all other states; to regulate the succession of their governors; to take part in every quarrel;

to claim the lands of one party for assisting him, and seize the lands of the other, after beating him ; to get allies by force, and take care that nobody shall rob them but ourselves ; to quarter troops upon our neighbours, and pay them with our neighbours' goods—This it is that we call Roman policy. While *Tippoo* is despoiled for befriending the French, and the *Nizam* is despoiled for befriending the English ; while *Holkar* is despoiled for beating the *Peishwa*, and the *Peishwa* is despoiled for being beaten by *Holkar*—Who is it that is enriched by befriending and beating them all ?”* England—England is enriched. This, and not self-defence, is the cause of war in the East Indies. War is a *judgment of heaven* upon the nations that are engaged in carrying it on. Britain is seldom or ever at peace with other nations. She must, as a body politic, be a heinous transgressor. There is no avoiding the inference. God is just ; and all his judgments are truth. Like ancient Rome, the most criminal of nations, *She* holds the stakes for every game that is played by the sword and the cannon, and whoever loses or wins, she is ultimately the gainer by the quarrel. Providence will overrule ; and they who thrive by the wages of iniquity, must expect a day of retribution.

England, I admit, enjoys within herself comparative prosperity. Her nobles are at ease and in affluence. Her merchants are opulent and prosperous.

* Edin. Rev. Vol. vi. p. 469.

Her yeomanry, although burdened with taxation, are healthy, and industrious, and flourishing. Her manufacturers, though embarrassed by the American war, are still influential and wealthy. The spirit of liberty in England, and Scotland, and Ireland, has given way for a time to the claims of the crown; and for fear of foreign domination, the subjects submit, with resignation, to their doom. The judiciary, with the exception of that of Ireland, which has always, like a conquered province, been ruled with a rod of iron, is sufficiently independent to administer common justice. In Scotland and England, personal liberty is in a great measure enjoyed: and yet, even in relation to her domestic policy, *Britain is very cruel.*

In Ireland, for reasons of state, she persecutes the *Catholics*. It is not on account of their religion; for this she has always supported on the continent; but for their dissent from the English hierarchy, that the Irish are oppressed. She reduces the Presbyterians to pay tithes to an indolent, and often an absent and immoral priesthood, whom they neither know nor revere. In all her dominions, she restrains the spirit of independence and emigration, not by rendering home comfortable, but by laws and officers, who bind the intended emigrant as if by right, to the spot in which he was born. She authorizes bonds and captivity, by the *pressgang*, that secret, sudden, and formidable engine of despotic power, which seizes upon its victim unawares, and chains him to the wheels of the cannon—A system of op-

pression and cruelty, compared with which, the *Conscription* of Napoleon was equitable and desirable. A tour of hardships, foreseen, regulated by law, equable, because extending equally to all classes, is not to be compared to a sudden seizure, partial, unexpected, unprovided for, and without the hope of escape. Regular occasional service, however hard, is not to be compared to slavery without redress.

Cruelty is exercised also on the conscience. Although subjects have the contemptible permission, of living unmolested, by the king, while they are silent and submissive; yet the government makes a mockery of conscience; corrupts the morals of the subjects with ensnaring oaths of allegiance, repeated, and repeated; and constrains them to forego integrity of religious character, by partaking of the *Sacramental Test* as the price of admission to power.

There is *one other feature of British policy*, to which, under this head, I would direct your attention.

The English merchants and monopolists, are men of *princely* fortunes. They, with the *Lords* of the soil, and of the *political church* of the land, (for such is the church of England as established by law,) may easily acquire a character for splendour and munificence. But how is it supported? Not by the islands of Great Britain. It is by the policy of that government relative to its trade. The commercial monopoly is the staff of pride and power. The

usurpation of the seas is an act of injustice. It is a system of cruelty towards the weaker states, that drives them from the ocean. It is the cruelty of a licensed robber, that attacks the traveller upon the highway, and prevents him from prosecuting his journey to the market. This, this is the cause of war. Britain is scarcely ever at peace, because she seeks the destruction of her neighbours' commerce.

War is an evil. It is a school of vice. It is a nursery of debauchery. By it, cities are sacked, and countries laid waste. The dearest ties of kindred are unloosed, fathers made childless, children fatherless, and wives converted into widows. You see, brethren, some of its pernicious effects in this city: and you feel and lament the evil. You hear of greater evils in other parts of our land, during the short period since war has upon our part existed. You deprecate the calamity. You regret the policy which led to such a state of things. You are tempted to call in question entirely, the *legitimacy* of war. It is not surprising you should. What more cruel, and less congenial with the spirit of the gospel? But England is scarcely ever at peace. Such scenes are essential to her commercial greatness. Her naval superiority is her glory. From the *Baltic* to the *Ganges*, she is shedding human blood. And is she then innocent? The agonies, the cries, the death of a thousand victims, on the shores, on the seas, in the cities of the nations, are the concomitants of that immense opulence, which the traveller admires in *Liverpool* and in *Lon-*

don. Twenty years of peace, in the civilized world, would reduce *Great Britain* from her rank among the nations. Allow the continental powers of Europe a free and a fair commerce; allow to these United States the unrestrained right of carrying their trade from sea to sea, and from nation to nation; allow to all the nations equal rights, while *ploughing the deep*, uninterrupted by the *men of war*, and the glory of England, like that of Tyre, shall sink to rise no more. Her policy is in war; and that *policy is cruel*.

CONCLUSION.

THAT NATION, the *Government* of which we have thus *weighed in the balances*, is, nevertheless, entitled to our christian attention and admiration. There, the sciences and the arts are patronized and cultivated, and most liberally rewarded. There, among christians of every denomination, is the honourable strife, who shall do most for promoting the diffusion of revealed truth throughout the world. There, treasure is collected, and hands are employed, for stretching over the perishing heathen the curtains of Zion. There, exists that noble institution, which exceeds any thing that has hitherto been established by christian exertions, THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY—A river of life, which, with its thousand streams, flows through every kingdom of the world, watering, refreshing, and fructifying, until the wilderness become like Eden, and the desert like the garden of the Lord. There, in despite of the

immoral tendency of the laws ; in despite of the public prostitution of religion ; in despite of the pride, and the debauchery, and the licentiousness of the great ; and of the misery, the baseness, the wickedness of the rabble, which prowl through the streets of the populous cities ;—there, exist much patriotism and courage, a feeling of personal liberty and independence, learning, and talent, and piety, and great domestic order and happiness.

We admit all this with pleasure ; we pray for the prosperity of christian men and christian institutions ; we are anxious to hold them up to others for imitation ; we love them sincerely ; and we supplicate the throne of grace for their promotion and permanence : but we do not admit them as a justification of the evils we have pointed out. They increase instead of diminishing the guilt of the government. It is the art of the writers of Romance ; it is the great evil of the *drama*, to introduce a character possessed of certain noble traits, that may palliate and recommend vice and impiety ; and so pollute the morals of the unwary. Wo to them that call good evil, and evil good ; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. We distinguish ; we contrast the good with the bad : and while we admit and approve what is righteous among the people of those islands, we bear our decided testimony against the usurpation, the superstition, the apostacy, the Erastianism, and the cruelty of the British system of government.

I have now, my brethren, *weighed in the balances*, the British monarchy and the American republic. They are both *found*, in some instances, *wanting*. But the difference, in point of immorality, between them is great. There is scarcely any comparison. Our country has indeed transgressed, and we are at this moment suffering the chastisement which we deserve. The enemy is let loose upon our borders. God grant to us the sanctified use of the blow, and direct us to the means proper for warding it off. May the God of heaven succeed our efforts, in the field, on the lakes, on the ocean, and in the councils of negotiation, for bringing the enemy to a sense of justice.

Should we suppose an intelligent man elevated to some spot in space, above the world, whence, without partiality to either of the belligerents, he could take a survey of both, and mark the contest between them—He would, upon principles of humanity, wish success to the most innocent in the combat. Independently of the causes which produced the strife, and of the consequences which would result, this must certainly be the wishes of a philanthropist on beholding the character of the parties at war. Did you see a youth of mild demeanour, and of known integrity, engaged with an experienced and long practised boxer, who made a trade of boasting and of battle, you would instinctively wish that this youth might escape unhurt, or come off victorious. The inference I draw is, that, in the present contest, between the belligerents described in this discourse, humanity wishes success to our own country.

CONCLUSION.

the causes and proximate consequences of the present war, I intend, hereafter, to turn your attention. Independently of these, our acquaintance with the national character of the parties, furnishes an argument in support of our hopes.

There is an *eye* above the earth, that knows the nations, that marks their conduct, that observes the strife. There is a *Man*, elevated above the world, with whom is no respect of persons, who is touched with the feelings of our infirmities, and will award to men and to empires their due. Christians, it is your Redeemer. Behold him on high, at the right hand of God, exalted above all principalities and powers. He is Prince of the kings of the earth. He rules in the battle, He directs the storm. He is mindful of individuals. He will save them that trust in him. He will bless and protect his church, while the nations are at war. He invites you to come under the shadow of his wings. There you shall have rest. His voice of peace is heard, while his hand controls the battle. Yes, brethren, while his Almighty finger writes upon the palace-wall, this sentence against the nations, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN, to you he says, *Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast.* AMEN.

THE LAWFULNESS OF DEFENSIVE WAR.

SERMON III.

With good advice make war. Prov. xx. 18.

WHEN the son of Jesse was pursued by Saul, the king of Israel, among the sheep-cotes of Engedi, he had an opportunity of inflicting personal vengeance upon his persecutor, in a cave, to which he had retired. The temptation was strong; but *David* resisted it, waiting the time, appointed by the Lord, for his own exaltation to the throne. He fortified himself, by an ancient maxim, in the resolution of permitting the escape of his enemy; and to that proverbial saying he afterwards referred king *Saul*, who was surprised at this remarkable instance of patience and magnanimity upon the part of a much injured man. “The Lord avenge me of thee: but mine hand shall not be upon thee. As saith the proverb of the ancients, wickedness proceedeth from the wicked: but mine hand shall not be upon thee.”* It appears from this expression, that, in this early age, David revered the practical wisdom and morality of antiquity, as communicated to posterity in pro-

* 1 Sam. xxiv. 12, 13.

verbs. It becomes us, who believe in the scriptures, to hold in superior veneration the ancient aphorisms of the *son of David*. These are not merely descriptive of the general temper and morals of the age; but are maxims of sacred law for the direction of our conduct in every situation of life. They have a higher authority than antiquity, to recommend them. The proverbs of Solomon are *the dictates of the Holy Ghost*.

The writer had, under the influence of this spirit, the power of giving peculiar point to the proverbial style; and from his works, as from an abundant storehouse, succeeding ages have drawn their best maxims. Desirous of employing his great wisdom for the benefit of mankind, this enlightened monarch devoted his leisure hours to writing for their instruction. His productions were numerous and comprehensive. Besides his *three thousand proverbs*, and his *one thousand and five songs*, or poems; he spake *of trees, from the cedar to the hyssop, of beasts, of fowls, of creeping things, and of fishes*. His works on *natural history* are lost to us for ever. Let us not repine; but with gratitude and submission, improve his doctrinal and moral writings, for our own edification.

In the verse, which I have chosen for my text, the wise man recommends caution and circumspection. Good counsellors, while they do not destroy the *decisiveness* of character, necessary to success on great emergencies, furnish the information required, in or-

der to act with understanding and with confidence. In those disputes between *nations*, which must ultimately be settled by a trial of arms, such advisers are peculiarly estimable. *Every purpose is established by counsel: and with good advice make war.*

The peaceful son of David, declares in this aphorism, the *duty of waging war, and of waging it only with prudence.* He did this under divine inspiration. He spoke the language of good sense, of sound policy, and of true piety. He gave an advice, perfectly corresponding with that given afterwards by our Lord Jesus Christ, the *Prince of peace*, of whom Solomon was the type. Luke xiv. 31. *What king going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth, whether he be able—to meet him?* This mode of reasoning, is a New Testament confirmation of the Old Testament doctrine, WITH GOOD ADVICE MAKE WAR.

The plan of my discourse on this text, I now lay before you.

War is, in certain cases, lawful—Lawful war is defensive with a rational prospect of success—Such a war ought to be supported.

These, my christian brethren, are very plain assertions. They are the principles of my text. The truth of each proposition is so obvious, that there is, indeed, little need of either argument or proof: but, there is no truth, however self-evident, that some one

does not dispute. Great talents have been employed, in the learned world, to prove that I may reasonably doubt of my own existence. In the christian world, some ingenuity has been employed, to disprove the positions now laid down, and of course to prevent the civilized world from acting upon them.

Did the arguments, which are used to show that war is prohibited in every case, by the christian religion, tend in fact to diminish the evil, I certainly should never raise my voice against them. Knowing, however, that they are not only untrue, but unoperative; not only unoperative as to the object professed; but mischievous in their consequences, by fostering the evil which they propose to prevent; I feel it my duty to meet them, and refute them. Disputations more frequently engender strife, than minister to the use of edifying. Calling in question the lawfulness of war, in any case, puzzles, and divides the well-meaning part of the community; but, has no other influence upon the designing, than to afford them an opportunity of converting to their own schemes, the existing contentions and prejudices.

By producing distractions in the more simple, and free, and moral states, the unprincipled and ambitious politicians of the nations are encouraged to prowl for their prey, and deal in unceasing wars. It is not by *disputing the right* of enacting penal statutes, and inflicting punishment, that domestic peace and order are secured; but by instructing the com-

munity in their legitimacy and utility ; and so, commanding the whole force of the nation, in support of the arm of authority, in executing speedily, upon the disturbers of their repose, the merited sentence of the law. It is in the same way, and for the same reasons, that international equity and peace will be secured to the world. When nations shall come to understand the rights of war and peace ; when they shall be prepared to judge of the justness of combats ; when they shall be disposed, without distraction, to yield their support to equitable claims ; when they shall be prepared to undertake, and to maintain lawful war against the aggressor ; then, and not till then, shall states be allowed to enjoy undisturbed quietness, and to rest in the bosom of peace. Therefore do I now undertake an illustration of the truths which I have proposed from the text, in the order already mentioned.

I. *War is, in certain cases, lawful.*

The strife of arms, in which man is set against man, and people against people, is, in all cases, an evil to be deplored. In most instances, it is a crime in both the parties ; and, in every instance, there is on the part of one of them, injustice towards the other. It is permitted of God, for the correction and punishment of transgressions, and it is to be referred, for its source among men, to the corrupt passions. *Of the works of the flesh are these, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife. From whence come*

*wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?**

Far be it from me, while explaining the precept of my God, "With good advice make war," to encourage that which is sinful: to cherish the malevolent passions: or to recommend the military life as desirable. It is to suppress the malevolence of man, to redress injuries, to promote righteousness, that the sovereign of the world ever authorized an appeal to the sword; and it is with the same design I vindicate the morality of what he hath authorized. Strange phraseology, indeed, to be required among christians, *vindicate the morality of what God hath authorized!* and yet it is required in this discussion.

WAR IS THE EMPLOYMENT OF FORCE UNDER THE SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY OF ONE CIVIL COMMUNITY AGAINST ANY OTHER.† That it is lawful to use such force, I shall show from *reason* and from *scripture*.

1. *The lawfulness of war is a deduction of sound reasoning, from the circumstances of civil life.*

To live in a *state of society* is both the duty and the privilege of man. It is the Creator of the world, who said, *It is not good that man should be alone.* A

* Gal. v. 19, 20. and James iv. 1.

† In all correct reasoning, it is necessary to keep in view the meaning of the words we employ. "War is that state in which a nation prosecutes its right by force." *Vattel*.

great part of the active principles of human nature would remain unimproved and unemployed, and much of his happiness would necessarily be cut off, were man doomed to a perpetual seclusion from society, and constrained to spend his life in solitude. It is not, however, to be expected, that a state of society can exist on earth, during the continuance of our imperfection, in which no error in morals will obtain. *Humanum est errare.* Diversities of views, and of inclinations, and of interests, cannot fail to produce discord; and the corrupt propensities of individuals require, for the preservation of social order, that the power of suppressing evils should be placed in the hands of competent authority. An *advisory authority*, unless endowed with the right of employing *force*, would be found a nullity. Thus, as society is necessary to man, and government is necessary to society, the application of force is essential to both: and the application of force to the correction of erroneous conduct, necessarily implies, that civil society has the power of property, liberty, life, and death, over every member. Such is the constitution of society. SUCH IS THE WILL OF GOD, expressed in the constitution of human nature. Let *theory* say what it will, it is a *fact*, that civil society has the right of taking away by force the life of any of its members.

In vain am I told, by visionary theorists, that man has not the right of taking away his own life. I know it. The Lord giveth life. He only has the right of taking it away, or of ordering another to take it

away. In vain am I told, that society has only the rights which individuals have surrendered to it: and that of course it has not the right of taking away my life, seeing I could not surrender what was not at my option. I did not make myself a social being. God made me so. *Society is his creature.* From him it derives the right of self-preservation. Civilians and Divines behave to attend to this fact. It is Atheism, however it may be disguised, that supports the contrary principle. He is a short-sighted Statesman, who, enamoured of the theories of *Beccaria* and *Voltaire*, argues against the right of *capital punishments*, in any case. It is not *humanity*, but *folly*, that dictates this doctrine. He is a short-sighted Divine, who is seduced by the reasonings of *George Fox* and *William Penn.* It is not religion; but fanaticism, that is promoted by such arguments.

I know, that small societies, in the bosom of regularly organized nations—I know, that ecclesiastical bodies may exist, without the application, upon their own part, of violence to any member; but the power of force must exist somewhere, otherwise, one unruly member might destroy any such society.

Laws are necessary to guard the rights of property; but if society have no right to transfer so much of the debtor's property, against his will, into the hands of the creditor, as may satisfy equity, laws are a non-entity: again, if the debtor resists the officers of the law, and society has no right to apply force in any case, the debtor escapes with impunity.

and laughs at the law. Legislation is still a nullity. If force may be applied in any measure, short of inflicting wounds and death ; if the debtor knows beforehand, that no power dare touch his life, he may arm himself ; he may escape the law with all its other force ; and he may lay under contribution, to his *cupidity*, every member of the community. There must in such case be an end to society. This is obvious to every man. Each state is of course compelled to arm, with the sword, the civil magistrate. Each individual will say, though I have no right to destroy my life, I have power to amputate a member for the preservation of the body : and each state will say, I have power to cut off any member for the safety of the whole.

This argument puts beyond a doubt the lawfulness of war. *Civil punishment is the exercise of force upon an enemy, to the community of which he is a member.* The lowest degree of punishment, involves the right of taking the life of the criminal if resistance on his part render the application of such force necessary. Most assuredly then, if the aggressor be of a different community, and be authorized by such community to act as an enemy, the sovereign power of the injured commonwealth may lawfully resist even unto blood ; and may apply the degree and kind of force necessary to correct the evil. If the right of waging war be withheld from the body politic, there is an end to the independence of nations, and all society is dissolved.

Reasoning upon these principles, I am constrained to pronounce the contrary opinions, by whatever names, and from whatever motives, they are urged, both unreasonable and dangerous. It is the will of God, expressed in the constitution of society, that nations have a right to wage war: and if it should ever be made manifest, that the Deity, by positive injunction, prohibited the exercise of this right, I would indeed submit to his decision, and submit implicitly; but I would also infer, that, in making such prohibition, he, who knows the consequences of his own laws, had also ordered the dissolution of society itself. So far is the revelation of his grace from giving countenance to such absurdities, that I am enabled thereby to support the principle urged in my text, *With good advice make war.*

2. *The lawfulness of war is evident from the scriptures.*

In presenting the argument, drawn from the expression of the will of God, in the sacred oracles, in favour of the right of making war, I do not forget or conceal, that it is principally contained in the Old Testament. I also know, that in the opinions of many professors of religion, this is a sufficient reason for rejecting the proof. As all, that referred to a *Saviour expected*, but not as yet *manifested in the flesh*, in the Old Testament dispensation, has been superseded by the Redeemer, in his mission, sufferings, and exaltation; as all, who believe in his

name, are not of sufficient discernment, to distinguish between morality and mere ritual economy; and as prejudice and convenience are fruitful in misapprehension and misapplication, it is not wonderful, that some of our brethren should be tempted to undervalue the principles of moral order which are revealed by the prophets. It is, nevertheless, a matter of lamentation, that such misunderstanding should be so general and injurious. Very few christian societies exist, who have not erred on this subject. The church membership of our offspring—the use of our psalmody—the theology of civil polity—the existence even of moral obligation—the utility of the Old Testament, have all, by different sects of professed christians, been called in question on this account. “There is not,” says one,* “a revelation of a future state made to those who lived before the advent of Messiah.” “Where,” says another,† “will you find in the Old Testament, the doctrine of faith, or of imputed righteousness.” While the minds of christians are thus amazed and bewildered, it ought not to surprise us that some good men have denied the applicability of the argument, in support of the right of *waging war*, which all admit, is abundantly to be found in the bible. And yet, we are not permitted to give up those great principles of morality, which it hath pleased God to reveal, and to sanction with his own authority. It is due to my

* Bishop Warburton.

† Rev. Mr. Freeman, of Newburgh.

hearers, to say, that, in referring for proof to inspired men before the incarnation of our Lord, I do it upon this broad principle, that MORALITY AND PIETY ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME IN EVERY AGE OF THE WORLD.

Man is *essentially* the same through all generations. God is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The image of God, on the soul of man, is at all times and places of the same character. Precepts, the reason of which is laid in changeable circumstances, cease or change with the occasion; but *principles, founded upon permanent relations, are unalterable*. Although men should now pretend to more holiness than was possessed by Abraham, by David, by Samuel, by Elijah, and Nehemiah, this, however great the assumption upon their part, would not justify their denial of the right of war, unless they could at the same time show, that human nature is not now what it was, or that God, the Lawgiver, has undergone mutation both of nature and of will. If holiness, now, is the same as ever, then is war as lawful as formerly: for that it cannot have been forbidden by him who once authorized it, is evident from the fact, that there is no reason for a change of law, as well as from the necessity of its legitimacy, if society be not entirely dissolved.*

We now proceed to lay before you, from both the Old and the New Testaments, (for in this case I

* See the preceding argument, page 109.

make no difference between them,) a summary view of the argument in defence of the *right of waging war*. We have in the bible, in vindication of this maxim, *Approved facts—Doctrines—Precepts and re-proofs—Promises and prayers*.

First. *Approved facts*. The history of Abram, of Moses, of Joshua, of the Judges, of the Kings, and the Governors, affords such an abundance of instances, in which war has been waged by Divine approbation, and often at his express command, that there is no need of specification. I do not, therefore, take up your time with references and explications.

Second. *Scripture doctrine inculcates the maxim*. I take my proof from the New Testament as well as from the Old. Rom. xiii. 3, 4. "*For RULERS ARE not a TERROR to good works, but to THE EVIL. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the POWER! For he is the MINISTER OF GOD to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for HE BEARETH NOT THE SWORD IN VAIN: for he is the minister of God, A REVENGER TO EXECUTE WRATH upon him that doeth evil.*"

I never, in the course of my reading, met with so perfect a description of the nature, the duty, the province, and the design of civil government, in so short a compass, as we find in the first six verses of this chapter. Without reference to any particular country, but with a perfect applicability to all, the apostle lays down the *doctrine of civil sovereignty*, according to the christian law: and he affords another

evidence of a truth, which ought never to be forgotten, by those who consider man in his social character, that the revealed will of God embraces the true philosophy of government. Individual man derives from God the right of self-government. Hence the sacred origin of personal liberty. Man, in his collective capacity, derives from God the right of government; hence the magistrate is his *ordinance*—*He is the minister of God*. The design of this institution is the good of society—*He is the minister of God for good*. His province is the protection of virtue, and the suppression of evil. *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil*. In suppressing evil, the national sovereignty is divinely armed with vengeance—*The minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath*.

These are not the words of a vain philosopher, carelessly slumbering over ideal plans of reform. They are words of truth. The idea of civil punishment which they convey, differs entirely from the fanatical imaginations of deluded minds, and from the pretended discoveries of infidel humanity. The sword of the sovereign, is not merely *disciplinary* as an instrument of reform; it is also for *vengeance*. Punishment is not prospective, but retrospective. It contemplates not so much the capability of improvement, as the guilt of its subject. It is the connexion established by the moral Governor of the universe between pain and crime. This is punishment and he is but a novice in the science of jurisprudence, who has the idea yet to learn.

Now if the magistrate does not bear the sword in vain, he must use it. It is put in his hand not for show, but for execution. He is not decked in military habiliments for mere parade. He puts on his armour, to strike with terror the enemies of his country. God gives him the right of waging war. *He is the minister of God, attending continually on this very thing. As a man, let him be meek, peaceful, and forgiving. Let every man, in his individual character, be humane, conciliating, patient of injury, slow to anger. It is the law of Christ. It is strongly expressed, Matth. v. 39—41. I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.*

These precepts are not to be understood literally. They only inculcate patience and forbearance upon individuals; but if they must be literally construed, there is an end to industry and social order. You must leave your business, and go with the ruffian, without resistance, not only out of your way, whither he would urge, but even twice as far. You must not take out a defence at law against injustice: you must not only allow a man to take from your door, before your eyes, a part of your property; but also give him even more than he desired. You must put an end to the rights of property, and pronounce the law itself unchristian. You must not only bear with personal assault; but also encourage it by

turning the other cheek to him that smites. You must in nowise, by no means whatever, by gentle or violent means, by persuasion, or by the law, resist any evil that befalls you.

Who then is so blind as not to see the absurdity of such a construction? Who so childish as to use this argument against the rights of war? We must adopt a consistent plan of interpretation; and recollect that the *Author of the gospel*, while he, in this passage, urges upon *individuals* a forgiving disposition, lays down in another passage, the duty of the national *representative*, acting as *his* minister, to exercise vengeance on the aggressor. *He is a revenger to execute wrath.** This is the doctrine of Jesus Christ our Lord. It is the Holy Ghost, THE COMFORTER of our souls, that makes the declaration. He, who sanctifies and instructs true christians, hereby declares that *war is in certain cases lawful*.

I might multiply quotations: but I only add in this connexion, the words of Solomon. *By wise*

* *Εκδικος εις οργην*. The word *εκδικος* is derived from *εκδικω*, and that from *ex* and *δικη*. It signifies an *avenger*. He, who says to *individuals* in the preceding chap. Rom. xii. 19, 20. "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink;" says, in this case, of *the national sovereign*, in his official capacity, "he is the minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath." If this distinction were kept in mind, there would be no room for perverting scripture, constraining it to speak against the right of applying force for the correction of injury.

counsel thou shalt make thy war ;* the words of the prophet, relative to the sons of *Reuben* and their allies, *They cried to God in the battle, and he was entreated of them—there fell down many slain, because the war was of God* ;† and the words of *Hezekiah*, *I have counsel and strength for war*.‡

Third. *Scripture precepts and reproof.* God hath commanded war in some instances to be waged ; and hath reproved, in other cases, those who refused to carry it on. It is utterly impossible, however, that a holy God should command that which is in its nature *unholy*. That which is in itself *indifferent*, he may in his sovereignty command or prohibit : and the changeable circumstances and conditions, in which we are placed, may render alterations of divine law, predicated upon mutable relations, wise and becoming. But he never recommends malevolence, impotence, or unbelief. True, he *once* commanded *Abraham* to offer his own son *Isaac* upon the altar ; but this was as a trial of faith ; and he did not permit him to execute the deed. *Jehovah* has, moreover, a right to recall at pleasure the gift of life, and to appoint the executioner. And he doth so, when he calls a nation to war, and to kill the enemy. The mere taking away of human life, is in itself lawful ; for the equity or criminality of the act, depends upon circumstances. Homicide is innocent. The execution of the guilty is a duty. Murder is a

* Prov. xxiv. 6.

† 1 Chron. v. 20, 22.

‡ Isa. xxxvi. 5.

crime. Those who kill in a just war, are acting under divine authority. It is what he commands. Psalm cxlix. 6. *Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron.*

The Lord reproves both *cowardice and opposition to equitable warfare*. That spirit of slavish cupidity, which degrades men or nations, and disposes them to prefer ignoble peace to manly warfare, as it is base and pusillanimous, is also contemned by the word of God, which always recommends every thing that is truly great, magnanimous, and good. Gen. xiv. 49. *Issachar is a strong Ass, couching down between two burdens: and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute.* They have grossly misrepresented christianity, who have described it as a system subservient to the ambition of the *few*, and the reduction to servitude, of the *many*. It administers reproof in a vehement tone, to all, who, when duty called, refuse to co-operate in the maintenance of right, by war. Judges v. 19—23. *Zebulun and Naphtali, were a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death, in the high places of the field. The kings came and fought. Curse ye Meroz, (said the angel of the Lord,) curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.*

I add, in the *fourth* place, the scriptures assure us, *that prayers are offered up for success in war*, and that the Lord who answers prayers, vouchsafes *to promise both a blessing and success*.

I speak not, however, of the prayers, which Erastian power prescribes for the ministers kept in the pay of princes. I speak not of petitions mischievously granted or withheld, in order to gratify the mere party politician. I speak of the prayers of the intelligent believer; of the single-hearted christian; of him, who, uninfluenced by sordid considerations, pours out the desires of his soul to God, for a righteous cause, and for success to the means employed to secure its triumph. To such the Lord hath promised the victory, in a legitimate contest with the sword. Lev. xxvi. 7. *Ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fail before you by the sword.* 2 Kings iii. 18, 19. *He will deliver the Moabites also into your hand: and ye shall smite every fenced city.* Psalm xciv. 1, 2. *O Lord, to whom vengeance belongeth—show thyself. Lift up thyself, thou Judge of the earth, render a reward to the proud.* Verses 20, 23. *Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law? The Lord our God shall cut them off.* Psalm xlv. 4, 5. *O Lord, command deliverance—through thee we shall push down our enemies.*

I have trespassed, sufficiently, upon your patience, in arguing a case clear enough, without the aid of special pleading. The objections, which are usually

made to the legitimacy of war, in any cause, I have already anticipated, so far as they appeared to me to require examination. No man is more anxious than I am, to hear that all war hath ceased throughout the ends of the earth. I ardently pray for the time when men shall learn its arts no more ; but I cannot admit that the religion of the Son of God, proposes to tie up the hands of those who feel its power, and to reduce them into passive subjection to him, who delights in robbery and bloodshed. I plead in behalf only, of

II. *Defensive Warfare.*

In the application of force to the correction of injury, reason ought to guide ; and if the force to be applied, is obviously inadequate to the object, it is in vain to make the application. It is madness to attempt to remove mountains by human agency ; and it is criminal to risk treasure and life, by engaging in a bloody warfare without prospect of any success. In such a case, although cause of war exists, it is better to suffer than to contend. Upon this principle, those directions which are given in scripture, and which some have mistaken for a prohibition of resistance in any case, are to be understood. Upon this principle the martyrs acted, *taking joyfully the spoiling of their goods*, and passively submitting, under a righteous providence, to an injustice which they had no power to control. They suffered without resistance, because resistance would have only augmented the measure of their pains. This was

right. It is what was required of them by their God.

There is, indeed, an exception, in extraordinary cases, to the application of this rule. When the Lord expressly enjoins resistance, should it be only by a few or even by a single hand against a whole nation, man must of right obey ; because, however improbable success may be, obedience to heaven is the first duty. He, too, who gives the commandment, is himself able to make obedience successful. This was repeatedly exemplified in the history of Joshua, the Judges, and the Kings of Israel. The walls of *Jericho* fell at the *blast of the trumpet*.* Before *Gideon* and a company of *three hundred men*, the hosts of *Midian* were put to flight,† and *Elijah* the prophet successfully resisted the *armed companies of the king of Samaria*.‡

These, however, were extraordinary events, and do not constitute, in the common proceedings of life, a rule of conduct in undertaking war. It is in those cases, in which the issue of the contest may appear doubtful, that prudence selects the opportunity, and courage is displayed in turning it to the best advantage. It is manifest, notwithstanding, that whatever cause of war exists, it ought not to be waged without a rational prospect of success.

* Josh. vi. 20.

† Judges vii. 22.

‡ 2 Kings i. 12.

This is the command of my text ; and it is the direction of the Lord Jesus Christ himself. *What king going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth, whether he be able with ten thousand, to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand ? or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace.**

Having already established the maxim, that war is in some cases lawful, and having now shown that however great and just may be the cause for waging it, no nation should enter upon the strife without a prospect of success, I proceed to explain what is meant by

DEFENSIVE WAR.

It is necessary to be very particular in affixing correct ideas to this expression. Believing as I do, most sincerely, that no other kind of warfare is justifiable, without an express revelation from heaven : believing, that the prayers of the saints ought not to be withheld from those who are engaged in such a contest, and ought not to be offered in support of any other : knowing too, that agreeable to this rule, God approves of exertions and accepts of prayers, I feel it my duty, while addressing myself in Jehovah's name, to the Lord's people, to define the term to which so much importance is attached. This is the more necessary, because, while the words are on

* Luke xiv. 31, 32.

the lips of every one, the expression itself is somewhat equivocal ; and pains have been taken, in the common vehicles of current intelligence—in the private intercourse of social life—in the halls of legislation—and even in the pulpits of the churches, to play upon the terms, to increase their obscurity, and to give to them a meaning as erroneous as it is injurious, to the interests of this empire.

The expression, *defensive war*, is somewhat *equivocal*. I explain myself by a reference to the courts of law. When I apply to *defence* the term righteousness, and to *offence*, the term iniquity, I am to be understood as speaking upon moral principles. Offensive war is unjust, upon exactly the same grounds, that offensive or vexatious suits at law are immoral. Suppose one of you, my hearers, is attacked in your reputation, your property, or your person ; and perhaps your life itself is in danger. You avail yourself of the law, and prosecute the aggressor, in order to prevent the threatened injury, or recover for the trespass. In doing this, you act in *self-defence*. You do right. But when the suit is commenced, the *offender* becomes instantly, in law phraseology, the *defendant*, and you are the *plaintiff at the bar*. It by no means follows, that he who assumes the name of defendant, is not guilty. In the case stated, he is in fact the aggressor. What would you then say of a judge, of a counsel, of a jury, who would play upon the terms, defensive and offensive, and upon that use of law expression, proclaim you in the wrong ?

The truth is, that in applying upon moral principles, the epithet *defensive*, you must have recourse to the nature of the cause in controversy; and consider the original aggressor as the offender. You are, *in foro conscientia*, still the defendant, although he is, *in foro legis*, called by that name.

Suppose a nation, resting in the bosom of peace, is suddenly attacked by another; and one of its cities is taken, fortified, and garrisoned by the enemy. The offended nation raises an army, and in order to recover its own property, besieges the fortifications of the enemy. In this case, the enemy *defends* the fort against the assailant. Perhaps he makes a very heroic *defence*. But is it this siege that gives to the war its character of defensive and offensive, or is it the original injury—the cause of the contest? Again, suppose this city had been thus taken by the enemy, without any previous declaration of war; and that the peaceful nation could not raise an army for the purpose of retaking its own territory, without a formal declaration of hostilities. Such an instrument appears before the world; and the enemy thereafter meets it with a counter declaration, saying you have first declared war, I am therefore the defendant; would you believe him, and denominate the contest, upon his part, *defensive and just*? Supposing again, that this peaceful nation, unwilling to make its own city the scene of confusion, of carnage, and desolation, should, instead of attempting directly to recover it from the enemy, march an army into the ene-

my's own territory, with design both to make reprisals, which he might occupy as an equivalent, and to draw off the forces of that enemy from the position which he occupied, thereby transferring the war, with all its concomitant calamities, into the country of the original aggressor; I ask, would this transfer alter the moral character of the contest, and afford to the enemy a plea, that he is the *righteous defendant*? These questions must, by every man of sense, be answered in the negative. It follows, of course, that a play upon the words *offensive and defensive*, although it may serve to confound and distract the ignorant, is unworthy of any man of reputation, and entirely unbecoming the statesman or the christian. It also follows, that the question, whether war be on the part of any people, defensive, or offensive, depends entirely upon the causes of its commencement or continuance.

The *character of the war* does not, in any case, depend upon *the date of a declaration, or upon the place in which it is carried on.*

1. It does not depend upon the *date of the declaration of war*, whether it be offensive or defensive.

If lawful cause of war exist, it is right to wage it; and if it be right to wage it, surely it cannot be wrong to proclaim the intention, and explain to the civilized world the reasons for having recourse to arms. Declarations do not, according to the law of

nations, make the war, but explain its causes.* If one nation should injure another, or march an army in order to subjugate an independent people, must that nation, so injured, invaded, and threatened, be considered as the offender, because the first in *declaring* war? No. It of course follows, that the *date* of the declaration of war, does nothing towards determining its moral character as offensive or defensive.

2. It does not depend upon the *place of combat*, whether the war be, in fact, defensive.

The idea which I am now to oppose, is of home origin. The writers on moral science, and the law of nations, never thought it a subject worthy of discussion, whether it was lawful to carry the war into an enemy's territory. Neutral territory has indeed been held sacred by the sentence of public law; but it is too childish to set up a claim in favour of the aggressor in war, for the exemption of his own provinces from its calamities. The nation is one, however numerous its members, and the offender may be

* "*Ut bellum legitimum sit indictionem belli non videri necessariam.*" C. V. BYNKERSHOCK.

"The universal law of nations acknowledges no general obligation of making a declaration of war to the enemy, previous to a commencement of hostilities." MARTENS, Book VIII. C. 2. Sec. 4.

"As to the time of commencing war, it seems to be no way contrary to natural law, to say it is *at any time the injured party pleases*, after having received an injury. The meaning of a declaration of war seems to be, to call upon the injuring party to prevent it by reparation—likewise to manifest to all other states, the justice of the cause." WITHERSPOON'S *Moral Philosophy*, Lec. XIII. Sec. 2.

stricken in the most vulnerable part, whether upon his coasts, in his colonies, or in his capital. If the cause of war is sustained, *Great Britain* never can be accused of injustice for the invasion of *Spain* and *France*, nor her allies on the continent, for marching to *Paris*. The plea is as absurd as it is novel, that unoffending provinces ought not to be invaded; the sailor, the soldier, the merchant, and the tenant, are personally considered equally inoffensive; and for the same reason, none should be troubled in the contest: the war may be waged, but upon no person whatever, except the sovereign. Who is so ignorant as not to know that the sovereign is guarded, and unassailable but through his forces, and his country? Who so blind as not to see that war is waged against the nation as a body politic, and of course, so far as the end of war can be promoted thereby against every member of that body. It is not the member attacked, but the nature of the contest; it is not the place of the battle, but the cause in controversy, that determines the moral character of an existing war.

My definition of defensive war is, *The application of force by one commonwealth to another, for the purpose of preventing or redressing actual injuries inflicted or about to be inflicted.*

As to the *equity* of the war, little depends upon the magnitude of the injury. This consideration will of course determine its *expediency*. If the evil inflicted be small there is less excuse, upon the part of

the aggressor, for persisting in it at the risk of an appeal to arms. He is not entitled to impunity, on account of its being unimportant, provided it be a violation of right. It is for the offended party to judge of the proper measure of his own patience under suffering, and of the time and place, in which it is expedient for him to seek redress. Although the injury be only about to be inflicted, he may justly apply force to prevent it: a declaration of war previous to actual hostility, entitles the other to commence hostilities; and actions, which amount to a declaration, give the same right.

In such an important inquiry as this, I wish you, my brethren, to judge conscientiously for yourselves. I shall lay before you, therefore, in confirmation of my definition, the sentiments of approved writers on public law, and moral philosophy; and I shall then direct you to the bible, in order to put the question at rest.

1. *The Authority of Writers on Public Law.*

These writers have with one voice declared themselves in favour of the principles of defensive war, which I have laid down. They uniformly represent the lawful object of war as *threefold*; PRECAUTION against injury—RESISTANCE to its progress—and REDRESS for what has already been inflicted. When a nation is threatened with evil, war is lawfully waged in order to prevent it—this is *precaution*. When the national rights are in fact invaded, they may be de-

fended by the sword—this is *resistance*: and after a people have suffered injustice, they may declare war to recover an equivalent to their loss—this is *redress*: and all these are considered as *defensive war*. The rights, for the vindication of which, it is proper to contend with the sword, are capable of being reduced under three heads—LIBERTY—PROPERTY—AND NATIONAL HONOUR. War in vindication of any of these rights, is legitimate according to the maxims of public law. I give you my authorities.

“ There are causes for which we undertake war by the conduct of nature, as in the *cause of defence*—Because the law of nature is violated, war is undertaken. There is a THREEFOLD DEFENCE, *necessary*, *profitable*, and *honest*; yet we shall deem them all *necessary*. This defence is *necessary*, against whom an armed enemy comes—I call that a *profitable* defence, when we move war, fearing lest we ourselves should be warred upon—*Honest defence* is undertaken for other men’s sakes; to free him to whom injury is done, out of the hand of the injurious.”
AL. GENTILIS, *De Jure belli et pacis*.

“ War is *offensive* on the part of the sovereign who commits the first act of violence. It is *defensive* upon the part of him who receives the first act of violence. Nothing short of the violation of a perfect right, either *committed*, *committing*, or with which a nation is *threatened in future*, can justify the undertaking of a war: on the other hand, *every such violation*, when proved, and when amicable means

have been tried in vain, or when it is evident that it would be useless to try such means, *justifies the injured party in resorting to arms.*" MARTENS, *Book VIII. C. 2. Sec. 2, 3.*

"The objects of just war, are *precaution, defence, or reparation.* In a larger sense, EVERY JUST WAR IS A DEFENSIVE WAR, inasmuch as every just war supposes an *injury perpetrated, attempted, or feared.*" PALEY'S *Moral Phil. C. 12.*

"The causes of commencing war, are THE VIOLATION OF ANY PERFECT RIGHT—as taking away the *property* of the other state, or the *lives* of its subjects, or *restraining* them in their *industry*, or *hindering* them in the use of things common. The preservation of our property implies, that if others take such measures as are not to be accounted for, but upon the supposition of an *intention of wronging* me, it is often easier and safer to *prevent and disarm* the robber, than to suffer him to commit the violence." WITHERSPOON'S *Mor. Phil. Lec. 13.*

I might easily multiply testimonies, should it be deemed necessary; but I forbear. There is not one writer upon public law, who would venture his reputation before the world, by denying the principles of legitimate war, which I have stated. And it worst of all becomes the apologists of that nation, with which this republic is now at war, (a nation which is itself scarcely ever at peace with its neighbours,) to refuse their assent to the doctrine here laid down.

If it be criminal to defend by the sword, the rights which have been mentioned, no excuse whatever remains for the mistress of the ocean, as her votaries denominate the empire of Great Britain.

Addressing myself to christians, however, in the name of the Author of religion, I draw, from the rule and the instructions of my embassy, the most conclusive arguments.

2. *The Testimony of the Bible.*

We refer you only to three historical facts. They have the sanction of his authority who is alone Lord of the conscience. They serve to show that war is lawful when waged in defence of *liberty*, whether civil or religious—in defence of *property*—or in defence of *national honour and independence*.*

* In the history of the sufferings of the *Rev. Alexander Shields*, written by himself, an account is given of his examination before the privy council, and the justiciary of Scotland, in the reign of *James II.* where he argued the justness of DEFENSIVE WAR. The same doctrine was afterwards vindicated in his dispute with the BISHOPS, to whom he was referred.

He maintained his principles with great force and copiousness of argument. 1. From the law of nature. 2. From the practice of nations. 3. From the scriptures. He under the third head, particularly insists upon the *love of liberty, which christianity inspires and cultivates*, as exemplified, 1. In the *wars of defence* against tyranny, which the saints waged; and, 2. Which *revelation sanctions*.

1. He gives *eight* historical instances of the *practice of the Lord's people in defensive war*: viz. The Maccabees—The Bohemians—The Waldenses—The German Protestants—The Hollanders—The French Huguenots—The Poles—And the Scottish Reform

1. The *Patriarch Abraham* waged war for the recovery of connexions taken captive, and of property illegally seized. This is the first instance of warfare recorded in the scriptures. The narrative is given by the prophet Moses, Gen. xiv. That it is an instance of lawful war, is evident, not only from the equity of the cause, but also from the character of the friend of God, Abraham, the father of the faithful; from the success given to his enterprize as a blessing from the Lord; and from the benediction passed upon him by Melchizedek, who received, as the priest of the Most High God, tithes of all that he had when he returned home in triumph. Verses 18, 20. *And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of the Most High God. And he blessed him, and said, blessed*

ers. He proves beyond a doubt, that wherever true religion prevailed, there was a spirit of resistance to despotic power.

II. From scripture he presents five conclusive arguments. 1. *Approved Examples*, of which he adduces *fifteen* from *Abraham* to *Esther* and *Mordecai*. 2. *Scripture reproofs* for passive obedience and non resistance, of which he adduces *two*, Jacob's prophecy, and the song of Deborah. 3. *Scripture promises* to valour in lawful war, of which he enforces *fourteen* instances taken from the Old and New Testament. 4. *Scripture precepts* for resisting injury with the sword. Of these he produces *seven* examples. 5. *Scripture prayers* for war and for victory, of which he gives five conclusive instances.

Thus did he vindicate the lawfulness of resistance, to the arbitrary and Erastian power, exercised by the throne of Britain over its own subjects; thus did Mr. Shields defend the practice of those suffering christians, who were attached to the reformation interest in Scotland, and who, on account of their love of liberty and righteousness, had the name of *Whigs* first applied to them, by the advocates of arbitrary power in church and in state.

be Abram--and blessed be the Most High God which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand.

The origin of this war, for undertaking which God blessed Abram, was as follows. *Five confederated princes*, in the neighbourhood of *Sodom*, where *Lot* the nephew of Abram lived, had been reduced under tribute to *Chedorlaomer* king of *Elam*, and served him twelve years. *In the thirteenth year* they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, with three other princes as his allies, to crush the said rebellion. The four allied monarchs succeeded in conquering their five confederated enemies. Their cities were plundered; the citizens were taken captive; and *Lot* was among the number of the prisoners. When Abram heard this, he armed his three hundred and eighteen servants, and assisted by three neighbouring princes, *Mamre*, *Eshcol*, and *Auer*, who acted as his auxiliaries, he pursued the victorious foe, returning with his booty to his own land. The distance they had to go from the *plains of Jordan* to *Elam* and *Shinar*, to *Chaldea* and *Persia*, was great. Abram overtook them, and defeated them at *Dan*, but he found it necessary to carry on the pursuit, far beyond the bounds of *Palestine* to the neighbourhood of *Damascus*.

Here then, is a war carried on, beyond the limits of their own territory, by Abram and his allies; and that for the recovery of their friends who were taken prisoners, and in order to rescue from the enemy the spoils of *Sodom* and the other cities

of the plain. It was a *defensive war*, waged for *redress* of injury received—waged in behalf of liberty, and for personal property captured by another power. Abraham's conscience was too enlightened, and the spirit of his troops too courageous, to invent pretended scruples about geographical boundaries; their sense of personal liberty was too keen and honourable, to think of expense and danger, when their friends and their countrymen were taken away by force from their employments and their homes. It remained for a people of a different spirit from that which influenced *the father of the faithful*, to call in question, the legitimacy of making war, beyond the limits of their own country, for the purpose of recovering property unjustly captured, and for releasing their fellow-citizens held in bondage.

2. *Gideon*, by the command of his God, *waged war* against *Midian*, in order to recover the liberties of Israel, as well as the enjoyment of the fruits of their industry. The history is found in Judges, Chap. vi. and viii. It appears that the *Midianites*, and the *Amalekites* took possession of the fields of Palestine; and banished from the farms which they had formerly cultivated, the tenants of the soil. Those who were permitted to remain in their possessions, had to hide their sheaves when reaped, and to thresh their corn in secret, lest they should become a prey. Such an uncertain tenure of property was a great vexation. Frequent spoliations constituted an injury which required an appeal to arms for resistance and redress. The Lord God directed that hostilities be forthwith

commenced. Gideon obeyed ; and he delivered his country. The war was undertaken, principally, in defence of *property*, for obtaining and enjoying which *liberty* is essentially necessary. The Israelites, roused to action by the divine blessing, and led on to battle by the *son of Joash*, pursued the enemy beyond the *Jordan*, to the cities at the head of *Arnon*. Regarding the cause in which they were engaged, they thought not of limiting their defence by an imaginary line, until the end for which they took up arms was accomplished. They had to find and fight an enemy ; and they had no objection to meet him on his own territory. Gideon went up on the east of *Nobah*, learning that *Zeba* and *Zalmunna* were in *Karkor*. He put them to flight ; pushed the victory ; overtook the two kings ; made them prisoners, and returned in triumph to his own country.

3. The last instance to which I shall refer you, is selected from the history of the *son of Jesse*.

The narrative is found in 1 Chron. xix. and in 2 Sam. x. The case is as follows: *Nahash*, king of the Ammonites, had shown friendship to David before he mounted the throne of Israel ; and at his death, David sent ambassadors to pay his respects to *Hanun* his son and successor. The young king, influenced by the evil advice of his courtiers, insulted these ambassadors, by shaving off their beards, and disfiguring their garments. David heard of this, and indignant at the insult, prohibited the return of his

servants to the capital, until the reproach should be wiped away. *Tarry at Jericho until your beards be grown.* The children of Ammon understood the character of the king of Israel too well, to imagine, that he would put up with the indignity thus showed to his crown, in the persons of his public servants; and they accordingly made immediate preparation to meet the necessary consequences. *They saw that they made themselves odious to David*; and they called upon their numerous allies to come to their assistance. An army is collected to *defend* the land of Moab; and they encamp before the gates of their own principal frontier city, *Medeba*. In the mean time David was neither idle nor terrified. He ordered *Joab*, at the head of his army, to march to the contest. The order was obeyed. The enemy was attacked in his own country; and, before the gates of *Medeba*, the Syrians and Ammonites, although acting upon the defensive, were routed by the invading armies of Israel. The Syrians rallied, being reinforced from beyond the Euphrates. After retiring to *Helam*, *Hadarezer*, their king, waited there, until David with the Israelitish *militia* came and gave him battle. This second victory put an end to the *Syrian* war. Joab continued his success against the Ammonites, until having taken their capital, *Rabbah*, by storm, they also yielded to the conqueror.

This narrative explains the doctrine of legitimate warfare, and confirms, completely, what I have already said, in defining defensive war. Actual war was first commenced by David, and it was com-

menced too beyond the line of his own territory. It was prosecuted, moreover, against both the Ammonites and the Syrians, in their own country, until *Rabbah* was totally demolished, and the Syrians forced to submit to an Israelitish garrison established in *Damascus*.

It is not the *time* of declaring war, or of making the attack, nor is it the *place* in which the war is carried on, that determines its character. In every instance, except in giving the *first offence*, the Ammonites in this war acted upon the *defensive*. They never left their own country. They defended their own cities and their own firesides: but Israel came upon them, fought them, and subdued them. Still, however, this was, upon the part of Ammon, an *offensive war*, and on the part of David, a *defensive war*. The honour of his crown was affected by the indignity done to his ambassadors; and rather than be constrained to make suitable atonement, the Ammonites called their allies to their aid, and prepared for resistance. The king of Israel was a man of sense, a man of spirit, and a man of piety. He was too much of a soldier, a moralist, and a statesman, to say or to think, after he had *first* received the injury, that a war in defence of the honour and independence of his country, ought not to commence upon his part until the enemy attacked him in his own dominions. He saved his own kingdom, and made the provinces of the offender the theatre of the contest. Under the influence of the Holy Spirit, he prayed for his armies, while besieging the cities of the Am-

monites, as sincerely, and as acceptably to God, as if petitions were offered for Israel besieged by an enemy at the gates of Jerusalem. It is the cause of war that determines its morality: and David did not enter upon the bloody strife without a cause. He lived in a martial age. However much disposed to peace himself, the welfare of his people required the preservation of their independence. Of this there was little probability unless they were prepared for vindicating it by the sword. Had he suffered the insult to escape with impunity, he would have invited another and another, until the spirit of the people should be broken down, and his own pusillanimity become a byword. He chose the better part. He waged war to *punish the insolence of Hanun, and to vindicate the honour and preserve the independence of his country*. He was approved of God. He succeeded.

This, then, was lawful cause of war. Do you doubt it? For what then did David order Joab to the battle? *Because the enemy were preparing to give battle to him*. Very well. This I confess is a good reason. You admit this. You acknowledge, then, that if my enemy is preparing to give me battle, I may, without waiting for invasion, become myself the *invader*, and carry the war, for precaution, into his territory. You admit this. I ask no more. This is enough. *Invasion for precaution, is defensive war*. You fortify my argument. But you do not do justice to the king of Israel. The Ammonites knew his character better than you do. Why

did they call upon the Syrians to help them? Why did they encamp before Medeba? They knew they were guilty. They knew they deserved punishment. They knew David had magnanimity. They knew him better than you appear to do. They expected vengeance from the minister of God. They prepared for resistance. *They saw that they had made themselves odious—that they stank before David.* And we all know, that they received adequate punishment for their offences.

I have done. I have laid down the doctrine of legitimate warfare, from the writers on public law,* and from the word of God. I have only to add,

* *M. de Vattel*, admits the legitimacy of *offensive war*. But in his definition of it, he means no more, than we and other writers, in conformity to christian phraseology, include under the term *defensive*. He differs from us on this subject only in words. The sentiment is the same. “We may set down this *triple* end as the distinguishing characteristic of a lawful war. 1. To recover what belongs, or is due to us. 2. To provide for our future safety, by punishing the aggressor, or offender. 3. To defend ourselves from an injury, by repelling an unjust violence. The *two first* are the objects of an *offensive*, the *third*, that of a *defensive* war. CAMILLUS when he was going to attack the GAULS, concisely represented to his soldiers all the causes which can justify a war: *omnia quæ defendi, repetique, et ulcisci, fas est.*” *B. III. C. 3.*

Notwithstanding the general accuracy of this distinguished writer, it appears to me improper to call that an offensive war, which is, according to the definition, 2. *To provide for our safety by punishing the offender*. Certainly it ought not be called offensive to punish the offender. According to the writer himself, however, this is lawful war. *The cause of the contest determines its morality*: and this is the principle which I wish to establish.

III. When a nation is engaged in a lawful war, it is *the duty of all to afford it their support.*

This part of my discourse does not require much proof or illustration. Its truth will be generally admitted. The usual way of opposing belligerent measures, is by calling in question the necessity, or expediency, of having recourse to them; and this apology for opposition seems to acknowledge, that if war is necessary and equitable, it ought to be waged with the undivided force of the empire. Under absolute governments there is no examination of the character of any war necessary upon the part of the subject: he *must* obey; he is *forced* to give support to the contest in which his king is embarked. It is only in states, which are in some degree free, that there is need or use for argument; because in them only is the reason of the subject called to exercise. It is in a free country, too, that the citizens should best understand the moral character of war, and when lawful, bestow upon it their most decided support. Such a war is their own. However diversified the pursuits, the interests, and the opinions of the men who constitute a free and well-regulated commonwealth; there is no propriety in their being divided upon a question which respects resistance to foreign aggression. Subjects of local concern may be variously discussed, and perfect unanimity at the same time be displayed against the common foe. It may not suit the taste of every one to repair to the camp, and take an active part even in the most just

war: nor is there any necessity for this. In some cases it would be improper to relinquish other duties, and seize the sword of defence itself. Nay, it is possible, that in a just war, those who conduct it, may order what it would be criminal to perform, and may impose conditions of service with which it would not be lawful to comply. These and other accidental evils may be examined, reprov'd, resisted, and corrected, and yet the cause of war sustained, and the ends of the war prosecuted by the whole community.

That it is criminal not to support a just war, I argue in the following manner. Such a course of conduct, *Promotes the injustice of the enemy—Prolongs the war with all its concomitant evils—and is Prohibited by the Lord.*

1. *It promotes the injustice of the enemy.* Silence, signs, words, and actions—whatsoever, in its place, tends to prevent exertion in obtaining redress for injury, encourages the spirit which inflicted the injury, and so promotes the claims of injustice. When war is commenced, the contest is of course for victory. He, who desires that victory should avenge injury, and vindicate equity, will be at no loss to say to which side his affections incline. Every man in a free state is of *some* value. His opinions and his words have *some* influence. They ought always to be on the side of equity: and if our affections incline to those who wage a *defensive war*, we so far promote the good of human society. Never should

the christian, under any pretence whatever, speak or act so as to encourage *offence* against the rights of society ; so as to encourage the injustice of the foe, or to prevent the due execution of punishment upon the aggressor by the forces employed by an injured nation. Whether he engage in hostilities or not, every part of his deportment, and especially his prayers, should unequivocally promote the success of the legitimate side of the question.

2. Those who withhold their support from the war in which their country is engaged, do what tends to *prolong the evil*.

When appeal is once made to the law of force, the parties, if they do not cease to reason, employ discussion only as an auxiliary to the sword. It then becomes a contest for victory. The aggressor, influenced originally by principles of injustice, is not likely to be corrected by his own success. The history of nations affords no instance of claims, which occasioned war, being relinquished by the offending party, merely because the resistance of the other was feeble. When a people are divided, they offer themselves an easy prey to the aggressor ; and even, if they should ultimately succeed in redressing the evil, their weakness and discord certainly prolongs the contest. A protracted warfare, although ultimately successful, is a present evil ; and the friends of a speedy peace will always, in war, be desirous to employ the energy which alone can deserve and secure a peace. With the work of death none

should trifle. It is ruinous—It is cruel to prolong, unnecessarily, even a war of defence. In so far as any member of the community, in public or in private, distracts the councils, or impedes the progress of those who conduct the war, he evidently prolongs the contest, and does what he can to prevent the return of peace. So far the guilt of a protracted warfare is chargeable upon him. It is, indeed, an evidence of the displeasure of the Deity, when a people, instead of unanimously co-operating for punishing the aggressor, are so divided and enfeebled, as to prolong, for years, a contest which might be brought to a successful issue, almost immediately after its commencement. The man who withholds his support in such a case, is the enemy of peace: he loves his party more than he does his country, more than he does honour, and justice; more even than humanity, or his own interest connected with the return of peace, who strives, for the sake of party, to enfeeble the arm of authority, to withhold the necessary resources, and to discourage the soldier.

3. *The Lord of the universe*, who is also the God of battles, *reproves those*, who withhold from their country, their support in a lawful war.

If the terms upon which your country offers friendship and peace to the enemy be reciprocal and just, you are wrong to discourage your country, and so encourage the foe. If in your conscience you believe the terms offered to be just, you are self-condemned if you do not support your country in the

contest. The immoral and irreligious tendency of war ; its pains, its losses, and its dangers, proclaim the duty of having done with it as soon as possible. It is criminal to protract it ; and of course, it is displeasing to the Deity not to push it vigorously to an end.

He is a God of justice and of truth. He will have us to judge righteous judgment. He commands us to love the truth and the peace ; and to promote the knowledge and the practice of equity. Therefore he reproofs those who do not support an equitable war, as the cause of God, the Supreme Judge. Judges v. 23. *Curse ye Meroz, (said the angel of the Lord) curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof ; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.*

The part of Jewish history, in which this reproof is found, asserts the sovereignty of God, and places the female character in a striking light. The words quoted are used in the song of *Deborah*, the wife of *Lapidoth*, who by an extraordinary providence was raised up to the rank and the office of judge in the commonwealth of Israel. In the song itself, we have an instance of female genius, under the influence of divine inspiration, and glowing with poetic ardour, patriotism, and prowess. The prophetess appears, “ giving breath to the trumpet of war,” rousing the spirit of her slumbering cotemporaries, and directing “ the embattled host ” to contend for the liberty of her much injured country, to conquer and

to triumph. The *eighty years* of peace and prosperity, with which the tribes of Jacob had been favoured, after the death of Eglon king of Moab their persecutor, had enervated that people, and so occasioned their ignoble submission to the tyrannical encroachments of *Jabin* the Canaanitish king. Twenty years did this neighbouring despot insult the Israelitish commonwealth, and peculiarly vex and oppress the tribes of *Zebulun* and *Naphtali*. *Siscra*, the captain of his host, was one of the most able and distinguished warriors of the age, and had at his command an armament well arranged, and consequently formidable to a people who loved the arts of peace. The people of Israel, besides, separated into twelve distinct and independent principalities, and having no standing army to fight their battles, were not easily brought to co-operate so as unanimously to pour forth their militia, the only forces of the nation, in order to chastise aggression.

Under these circumstances a *female* appeared destined of the Lord to deliver her country from destruction, from insult, and from injury. Awakened, by present oppression, *Deborah* relinquished her ease and retirement under the *palms* of Mount Ephraim, and summoned along with her to the field of blood *Barak* the son of Abinoam, at the head of ten thousand undisciplined volunteers, to contend for empire with veteran troops supported by nine hundred chariots of iron. Barak was victorious. Sisera fell. Israel was delivered. Peace was restored. Those who supported the war, and waged it to a suc-

cessful issue, are praised of the Lord; and they who refused their co-operation, are placed by the prophetess under a divine malediction.

Ephraim, and Benjamin, and Issachar, these tribes that maintained the war, are commended. Reuben, split into factions by party spirit, occasioned lamentations in Israel—*For the divisions of Reuben there were great searchings of heart.* Two of the tribes were remarkable for their power and patriotism—*Zebulun and Naphtali were a people who jeoparded their lives unto the death in the high places of the field.* Upon Meroz, who entirely withheld her support, when the cause of her country prohibited neutrality—upon Meroz fell the curse of God.

THE CONCLUSION

From these premises is obvious to all my hearers. When your country is at war in defence of her rights, it is your duty to encourage, by all lawful means, her exertions in the strife. It is criminal to diminish her strength, or impede her progress. To this principle I would call your notice from the pulpit, while our friends and our brethren from the adjacent country are assembled around our city, to defend it from attack: while those among our fellow-worshippers in this house, who are fit to bear arms, are practising in the field the arts of defensive warfare: while all ranks and classes of our fellow-citizens are employing their hands and their money in raising bulwarks on every assailable point, to

protect our homes and our places of public worship, let us accompany them with our wishes and our prayers, lest we become an enslaved people.

Far be it from me to take advantage of the general alarm, to impel you to a forgetfulness of the duties which you owe to yourselves, to truth, and to your country, relative to those who have been entrusted, by the suffrages of a free people, to administer their government; to make, to apply, and to execute the laws. Examine, yes, examine, with rigorous impartiality, their character and their acts: speak out: blame them when they do wrong: But forget not your country. Unite in her defence—in defence of her injured rights. Support those who wield the sword, and who direct its application—support them with the means necessary to convince the enemy that, whatever may be the domestic strife for influence, for place, and for power, in regard to those who have taken your friends, and your fellow-citizens into captivity, who have interrupted and despoiled your trade upon the ocean, who have violated your neutrality, and who lay claim to your soil,—in regard to them, convince the enemy, convince your own rulers, and the whole world, that you have but ONE MIND. Defensive war is lawful—a brave people have the prospect of success—and a moral people will prosecute the contest to a successful termination.—AMEN.

THE PRESENT WAR.



SERMON IV.

With good advice make war. Prov. xx. 18.

THE principles of this proverb I have already stated and defended. To-day you expect the application. If the general doctrines laid down in the preceding discourse be admitted, we can proceed harmoniously in applying them to existing circumstances; but if the truth of these be disputed, we leave the case to your reflections, without urging our sentiments; well convinced of the difficulty of convincing men against their own inclinations. In order to refresh your recollection, and that you may judge fairly of the correctness of their application to the present war, I repeat the principles argued in the preceding sermon upon the same text.

WAR IS IN SOME CASES MORAL.

Reason and Revelation prove this.

WAR IN DEFENCE OF PROPERTY, LIBERTY, AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND HONOUR IS LAWFUL; AND

DEFENSIVE WAR MAY BE FOR PRECAUTION, RESISTANCE,
OR REDRESS.

Common Sense—Writers on Public Law—and the Word of God, prove this. The cases of Abram, Gideon, and David, furnish examples in illustration.

SUPPORT OUGHT TO BE GIVEN TO A JUST WAR.

A sense of Justice—the love of Peace—and the Sacred Scriptures, prove this assertion. It is illustrated by the inspired Song of Deborah.

Should any of my hearers, anticipating the application, which I would make of these principles to the *American side* of the present war, either express a doubt of their correctness, or deny their truth, I have not entirely lost my object. I take you at your option. However you may be disposed to consider your own country as the most guilty in the present contest, if you admit the principles which I have now repeated, the justice of this war upon our part will necessarily follow; and if you reject the general truths laid down, the *superior injustice* of the enemy will, in order to be consistent, be admitted by you. Take your choice; and let us reason together.

1. Do you deny the *lawfulness* of war in any case!

So let it be. I shall join with you for the time, in deprecating its numerous evils. It flows from the

malevolent passions ; and it encourages and strengthens the vicious passions from which it flows. It arrests the progress of improvement in society. It impoverishes countries ; and lays waste the cities of the nations. It exposes to temptations, and corrupts the youth. It exposes to danger and to death. It hurries into eternity, in an unprepared state, thousands of our thoughtless fellow-sinners, who might otherwise have had time and space of repentance. If it be entirely unlawful, it must of course be the greatest of crimes which man commits against man : and the nation which wages war is guilty of a heinous offence against the moral Governor of the world. Upon your principles, war is a national crime ; and the nation is guilty before God, and in your own estimation, in proportion to the magnitude of the offence. The greater the war, the greater the guilt. Piety too, abhors guilty nations. You, therefore, who consider war as a crime, will abhor nations in proportion to the extent of the wars in which they are concerned. Apply this. Blame your own country for her three years war. Set her down as guilty. Abhor her in due proportion. Lift up your voice against your rulers, who caused the nation to err, and are foremost in the crime. But what do you say of our foe ? Great Britain is also at war with us. You say, war is unlawful ; then, she too is guilty. Do you admit this ? Her guilt is of older date. It is of greater extent. It is of longer duration. She is scarcely ever at peace. Her guilt, upon your own principles, surpasses the guilt of all the nations of the earth. During the

last fifty years, she has shed more blood in India than has been shed in Europe: and in all the wars of Europe she is a party. Do you then believe she is the most guilty nation upon earth? Say so. Let your conversation and your political opinions manifest that you are in earnest. Show, that it is the abhorrence of all war from a pure conscience, and not a political bias against this republican country, the least guilty of the crime of war, that induces you to reprobate the contest. Declare, unequivocally, that as all war is unjust; as the guilt is in proportion to the extent and duration of the criminality, Great Britain is guilty of the greatest national injustice. You cannot avoid this conclusion. You cannot avoid the charge of insincerity, if you do not readily adopt this conclusion. But I have not yet done with this subject. I will try you further by your own moral maxims. *All war is crime—A nation is guilty in proportion to the scale upon which it sins by carrying on war.* These are your maxims. Then you declare that the power of the British empire is founded in crime. War hath raised her to her present splendour. Behold her navy—what you call the instrument of her guilt. It is her support and her glory. It is that very navy too, which hath proved the cause of our war with her. If we are guilty for going to war; she at least was the tempter. It was her war—according to your maxim, her crime; it was her crime against other powers that affected our neutrality, and of course produced the rupture. She despoiled our trade; she took seamen from our peaceful vessels. She forced them to the service of

sin; for you say *war is sinful*. Britain then, engaged with other nations in *crime*, sought occasion to force some of our people to take part in that crime. She committed a crime upon us. She is still guilty of the same crime. She continues at war. If, then, war is in all cases unjust, she is the most unjust. Examine your own hearts. Try, by your attachments, the degree of influence which your sentiments have over your inclinations; and most assuredly, you can no longer consider yourselves sincere, if opposed to all war, you yet remain the partizans of England in her strife with America. You will, if conscientious, speak and act in such a manner as to be above suspicion: and you will do me, I hope, the justice to acknowledge, that not my argument, but your own principle, holds up to the moral world the government of England as most worthy of christian abhorrence.

2. You will, perhaps, admit, that defensive war is lawful, but deny my definition of it to be correct. Will you give us your own definition of defensive warfare? Will you exclude *precaution* and *redress*, and confine it to *resistance upon your own soil against invasion*? I am satisfied: not, indeed, with the correctness of your views, but with the sufficiency of your own admission to the object which I have in view—to convince you that Great Britain is still the more guilty nation. Let then the definition you have given, contrary as it is to all authority, be the one adopted in the present case. *Resistance to an invading enemy is alone lawful war.*

This is *your* definition. You will allow me again to urge the duty of consistency. Abide by the application of your own definition. Tell me then, when did England wage a lawful war? When was her soil invaded? Are her armies confined to her own soil? Is her fleet confined within the limits of her own waters? Was it within British seas she blockaded the ports of the nations, plundered our merchants, searched our vessels, and captivated our mariners? No, my friends. According to your views of lawful war, England is the disturber of the nations: and her crime is her glory. She is proud that her soil is in safety. She triumphs in the idea, that her armies have overrun the provinces of her enemy. She boasts of wielding the trident over the ocean, and in the ports of the several nations of the earth. By your definition, as the apologists of England, you may condemn as immoral the achievements of our Browns, and our Scotts, our Gaines, and our Porters—You may condemn the invasion of Canada by the American arms: but certainly, you have an equal degree of guilt to balance, the account of criminality, between the belligerents, in the capture of Detroit, the invasion of Plattsburgh, the possession of Castine, the plunders of the Chesapeake, and of the cities which lie on its rivers, and its shores: and there is yet a vast portion of guilt to which there is no parallel. If it be unlawful to pass in war, the limits of our own country, you may blot from the number of your saints, the names of *Abraham*, and *David*, and *Gideon*: but you cannot justify that nation that has died in blood the snows of *Scandinavia*.

and the sands of the *Ganges*; that has kindled the flames of peaceful *Copenhagen*, and levelled to the dust the bulwarks of *Seringapatam*.

If it be unjust to wage war for the preservation of property, liberty, and national dignity or independence, I believe it will not be easy to find in the history of nations a justifiable war, or any nation so innocent of shedding blood as the United States of America. It is impossible to reason upon moral principles against the side of America in the present war, without exposing the immorality of the enemy. Every argument, that can apply, in *any* one case, against this country, will, with greater force, apply in *many* cases, to the other belligerent. Make the experiment, and you will feel the force of my assertion. In the books of the wars of England, no cause of battle which will bear examination can be found, if you reject as illegitimate those which have been mentioned. There is only one other conceivable cause. War may be waged in defence of religious rights in opposition to persecution. Of this cause, however, Great Britain in her wars cannot avail herself. The church of England is not suffering under persecution. She feels power; and however she may be charged by others with an intolerant spirit, she is under no necessity of contending by the sword for toleration for herself. There was a time when English *men* fought for their religious liberties. They contended against their own king, his prelates, his counsellors, and his arms. They contended valiantly, and their valour

deserves to be held in everlasting remembrance. That day is past; and alas! the descendants of the New-England pilgrims, the descendants of English and Scottish dissenters from prelatical usurpation, appear to have forgotten, in their admiration of the grandeur of British power, the mixture of superstition and misrule in the complex constitution of church and state in that land—the evil, of which their fathers complained, and under which they grievously suffered.

There are, in the British empire, both within and without her present ecclesiastical political establishment, men of virtue, of truth, of piety, who revere the memory of the Puritans, and who are themselves friends to the rights of humanity; who strive to diffuse the light of Christianity among the nations; and avail themselves of the opportunities which even criminal conquest may offer for that purpose. But the wars of the sovereign are not for the defence of religion. They are political. It is not by the Royal family, the counsellors, the nobles, or the army, that British piety is supported. It is not for the honour of religion that the sacrament is prostituted; and that dissenters are excluded from power. It is not in support of the great Protestant cause, that Papists are kept down in Ireland, and raised up to all the splendour of their superstition in Italy, in Spain, and in France, by the arms of England. It is not for the sake of Christianity, in the most extensive use of that word, that a revenue accrues to the British government from the Pagan

establishments of India. The wars, in short, of our enemy, wherever they are waged, are utterly illegitimate and unjust upon the principle of the definition which you have given, for the purpose of condemning, as unjust, that policy of your own government, which makes the provinces of the enemy, in some instances, the seat of the present war.

3. Do you give up the controversy about the nature of defensive warfare, and admit the justice of transferring it into the enemy's territory, but still deny the applicability of the cases which I have stated from the Bible?

I meet you upon this ground with cheerfulness. It is christian ground. Let the Bible direct our political conduct. Let this book decide upon the principles which we are to apply to the belligerent nations, in determining the measure of their rights and their wrongs. If I have misapplied its maxims, give *your* interpretation. I will adopt your own comment, and show you, that if its principles condemn the American policy, it will also condemn, with equal severity, and in more numerous instances, the moral character of British wars, for which you are an apologist against your country. You will again have an opportunity of examining, as a sincere christian, your own heart, and of trying, before your God, your scruples relative to the present war. You can then determine, whether they arise from tenderness of conscience, or from the prejudices of foreign partialities.

Offer your objections to the proof I have adduced from the Bible. Do you say the cases are not parallel? I grant it. The wars of Palestine differ in many things from the American war. Palestine itself differs from these lands which we occupy. The people too are in many things different from us. And yet, there are also many things in which their circumstances agree. But to gratify you, I drop all pretensions to maintain the parallel. I have cited the cases of Abram, Gideon, and David. *I have stated facts.* These facts are not disputed. Upon the facts, *I have rested principles.* These principles may be *applied.* It is not in order to amuse you with expert analogies, or in order to run a parallel, that I have opened the Bible. It is for the purpose of exhibiting principles, and the facts which support and explain them. The principles being discovered, every man may judge of the application. Do you deny *these principles?* War is lawful—defensive war is lawful—to prevent, resist, or repair an injury, is lawful—war may be waged for the defence of liberty, property, and national independence, if any of these are either threatened or violated. Do you deny these principles? No; you have admitted them. I will, therefore, *apply* them to

THE WAR IN WHICH OUR COUNTRY IS AT PRESENT
ENGAGED.

In making this application of the words of inspiration, “*With good advice make war,*” I design to show, that *The United States have lawful cause of*

war with Great Britain, and to explain The principles upon which the war should be prosecuted.

I. The Causes of the present war.

Whatever may have been the personal wishes or opinions of those who recommended to the congress a *declaration of hostilities*, the instrument itself, in which the declaration is made, and the *Report of the Committee of Foreign Relations*, assert facts, and contain reasonings, too true, to afford the impartial reader an opportunity of denying, upon moral principles, the legitimacy of an appeal to the sword. That in the recommendation of war, and in the ultimate decision, some of the men in power may have been influenced by personal irritation—others, by views of ambition and self-interest—and others, by fear of giving offence to patrons, or to constituents, I do not take upon me to deny or to affirm. Such motives, in some degree, enter very generally, into the reasonings and conduct of all men, and particularly of politicians; but even then, there may exist a love of country, and a sense of justice, modifying the less worthy motives. With the private designs of individuals, we have not in this inquiry so much to do as with matters of fact, which are of public notoriety. God judges the heart: but, it is known to the world, that for a series of years, the British sovereign was in the habit of injuring the interests and honour of this commonwealth. Whatever diversity of opinions may exist respecting the extent of the injury; and although the expediency and justice of the war,

at its commencement, may have been called in question, no man ever doubted that the application of the rule of the war of 1756, the orders in council, and the numerous blockading decrees of that nation, were injurious to the fair trade of America. The practice, too, of searching our vessels by their men of war, in order to impress our peaceful sailors into their service, as the fact has never been doubted, will be universally admitted to be a grievance—a heavy grievance to any people, and much more so to a free and independent empire.

There are two principles, christians, upon which you will express your accord. Whether the guilt of *provoking* the war, or of *commencing* it, be the greater, you will admit, both, that THE SIN, FOR THE PUNISHMENT OF WHICH IT IS PERMITTED BY THE DEITY, is chargeable upon us all; and that THE CAUSE OF THE CONTINUANCE OF HOSTILITIES, is different from *that* which gave it origin. If I shall have succeeded in proving that *the original grounds* of the declaration of war were moral, there can be no doubt of the propriety now of resisting an invading foe, or of continuing the contest until it terminate in an equitable peace. I do not rest my argument entirely upon the limited idea of defence, which is involved in resisting invasion, although in the present stage of the contest, this would suffice to prove its justice. He is unworthy of being treated with an appeal to intellect or conscience, who would dispute, after admitting the lawfulness of war in any case, the propriety of repelling, force by force, when a

cession of territory is demanded at the point of the bayonet, and invasion with all its horrors approaches his own door.

I affirm the *justice of the war from its commencement*. Our neutral trade was violently opposed, and almost totally destroyed; our property was captured; our fellow-citizens were enslaved, while peaceably pursuing their proper employment; and negotiation failed, after the exertion of years, to procure redress for the past, or immunity for the future. To recover and preserve property—To redeem and to defend men, these are lawful causes of war. These are the causes of the present war. The argument requires neither art nor eloquence. It is obvious to every capacity. It is irresistible. It may be evaded, but it cannot be refuted. If it fail in extorting confession, it cannot fail in producing conviction.

American property has been seized and destroyed: American citizens have been impressed and enslaved. These are the facts.

War in defence of property, of liberty, and of life, is lawful. This is the principle.

Apply the principle to the facts. The United States have declared war, in order to vindicate the rights of property, of liberty, and of life. Therefore is the present war, from its origin, a defensive and a just war. This is the argument.

You may speak about it, and write about it; you may close your eyes upon it; you may go round about, and fly from it: but you will in vain offer resistance to its truth. The facts are notorious. The principle is confessed. The application is necessary.

I use very plain language, my brethren; it is time to speak plainly upon this subject. Our country has suffered abundantly. Insult has been added to injury, by a people who regard the American republic with an evil and a jealous eye. They consider this country as a commercial rival. They are alarmed at its rapid growth in arts, in knowledge, in opulence, and in power. They affect to despise every thing that is American. By their publications in prose and in poetry, the English writers strive to keep their countrymen in ignorance of the land in which we live. They draw a caricature of our manners, our morals, our laws, and our religion. Their official reports, those documents in which the veracity of history should uniformly be found, are characterized by illiberality and misrepresentation. In diplomacy, they have practised delay; they have trifled, equivocated, and insulted. They have sought the glory of Great Britain, at the expense of the United States; they have endeavoured to divide and to destroy. The hatred which they bear to our republican institutions, envenoms the spirit of rivalry, with which they contemplate the progress of empire in the new world. Resistance ought to have been made long before it was attempted by this nation—It ought to have been made with unanimity and energy.

In vindicating the justness of this war, upon the part of the United States, there is one interesting question, to which I think it my duty to turn your particular attention. It is one of the principal causes of the war, that British officers have, while acting upon the right of search, impressed mariners from American merchantmen. This outrage upon the national independence, they have endeavoured to justify. The practice was convenient and profitable for the navy of that country; and they sought for a doctrine which might serve to give to it a semblance of equity. They strove to discover some general principle, which might at the same time gratify the national pride of England, and furnish a source of allegation and dispute, among the political parties existing in the United States. They found such a maxim in the despotic tenet of *perpetual allegiance* to the crown. This maxim, never admitted by any writer upon public law, who has a regard to character, or is worthy of a name, is no less false in itself, than inapplicable to the case in hand. Were it even true, that a native of Britain can never of right throw off his allegiance to the country which gave him birth, it by no means follows that the king has a right to take from his employments, any of his subjects, to serve him against his own choice.

1. He has not this right in his own dominions; and much less can he procure it, by violating the territory of a neighbouring nation. If he have no right to enter a private farmer's house in England, and force the son away from his father, and his mother, into

slavery ; certainly he has no right, by virtue of native allegiance, to force such a one away from any other lawful situation in which he may happen in providence to be placed.

2. If the doctrine of perpetual allegiance were true, it would not justify entering by force, and committing violence on board an American vessel. The right of search, for enemy's goods, or contraband of war, aboard a neutral, is tolerated, for the purpose of maintaining a fair trade ; but it has no connexion with the violent and injurious practice, of dragging men into bondage, when prosecuting a fair trade.

3. As perpetual allegiance gives no right of enslaving an English subject, by forcing him into a service which is not his choice ; much less can it justify the impressment of an American citizen. Urge, as you will, the similarity of countenance, of dress, and of language ; and the difficulty of distinguishing man from man : these remarks go only to show the propriety of omitting as *inexpedient*, the practice which is so liable to abuse, even if it were lawful ; but, on no principle of sound reasoning, can it afford any right whatever, to seize by force the person of a free man. It was reserved for the boasted wisdom of British partizans, to discover the argument, that an American deserved the punishment of impressment, into the naval service of the haughty empire, (whose cruel yoke had formerly been thrown off,) for no other crime than his *resemblance* to an Englishman. Does this denote servitude ?

4. The pretext of perpetual allegiance, can have no effect, in giving the semblance of equity to the practice, in the extent to which it has been carried by the officers of the British crown. They have claimed the right of removing from the vessels, aboard of which they entered by formal contract, men of all nations, who could not possibly be mistaken for natives of the British Isles. The Swede, the Dane, the Dutchman, the Spaniard, and the sable sons of Africa, have been ordered, under the lash, to quit the place of their choice, and enter aboard a man of war. Such are the outrageous acts which the plea of perpetual allegiance has been invented to cover. It has been repeated, and repeated, and repeated, until weak men, in despite of its absurdity, have been tempted to believe its truth.

Having shown its *inapplicability*, I go on to prove its *erroneousness*.

The question to which I particularly request your attention, is,

THE RIGHT OF EXPATRIATION.

The defence of property is one cause of this war. The defence of persons, is another. Both are legitimate causes. The seizure of men by the naval officers of England, took place under the plea of allegiance, which I have shown to be inapplicable. I undertake, besides, to prove that it is unjust. In taking this ground, I am not ignorant of the oppo-

sition made to the right of expatriation. I am prepared to meet it in all its force. The question has been discussed in Europe and America. The sailor and the soldier, the advocate and the judge, the lawgiver and the philosopher, the husbandman and the merchant, the mechanic and the courtier, the divine and the statesman, have taken an interest in the discussion. The decision affects all classes of men, and all the nations of the earth. It behoves especially, the christian moralist, to know upon which side the truth is found, in order to be able to acquit himself with a good conscience, wheresoever it may be his lot to reside. If allegiance to human governments be indeed unalienable, he who leaves his native country, never can enjoy the rights of a citizen in any other land; and, although the men of the world may sport with perjury, the christian, desirous to act as an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile, can never, by his profession or his oath, undertake to transfer an allegiance which is in its nature unalterable. Pitiably, indeed, is his case; bound by an iron law to the spot which gave him birth, or prevented, if he should venture to leave his first residence, from enjoying to the end of his life the privilege of a freeman in any other society upon earth. In vindicating the right of expatriation, I feel convinced I am on the side of humanity and godliness.

All men are born equally free—There is no obligation by contract to prevent entirely a change of country—allegiance and protection are reciprocal—all nations recognize the principle of expatriation—

the contrary doctrine leads to absurdity—and the word of the living God secures this right to man.

These are my arguments in defence of my assertion. I proceed to illustrate and apply them.

1. *All Men are born equally Free.*

The religion, which is from God, lays the loftiness of man, the pride of royalty, and the claims of noble blood, in the dust. It assures us that God *hath made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell upon all the face of the earth**—that all are by nature in a like sinful and dependent state. There is nothing in the bone, or the blood, or the head, or the heart of a king's son, to distinguish him from the infant peasant. There is no provision in nature or religion, for binding one man against his will to the service of another. Nativity, therefore, of itself, produces neither sovereignty nor allegiance: and it is of course but a violence against the laws of nature and of revelation to urge, on *account of birth*, a perpetual allegiance to any dynasty whatever. The relation of rulers and ruled exists only by contract. Society results from the constitution of human nature. It is the will of God that order should obtain among his rational creatures: but every man is free to select his own society, and make choice of the power to which he will submit for his protection.

* Acts xvii. 26.

2. *There is no obligation from the social compact upon man to continue in allegiance to the government under which he was born.*

That an individual may bind himself, by express stipulation, to certain services, in a given place, either for a specified term of years, or for life, is not denied: but such stipulation is not *implied* in the social compact. A nation, it is true, as well as any other body politic, may give pledges, and contract debts; and every member of the body is bound to redeem the pledge, and discharge the obligation, in its true spirit and design: but *no man is bound to continue a member, longer than the nature of the connexion itself requires.* There is not in the constitution of the body politic any such regulation as requires every man to abide in the country which gave him birth. It is not necessary to civil society, that such a principle should be recognized: it is not proper that it should: and even if the government should succeed in introducing it expressly unto the constitution, the stipulation, as it would be immoral, could not be obligatory. Seeing no man is morally bound to the spot in which he was born, and cannot lawfully be circumscribed by the limits of a prison, however extended, unless by transgression he has forfeited his liberty, it is perfectly preposterous to allege that a government, formed for a local jurisdiction, should claim, without his consent, the right of sovereignty over him, after having passed beyond the limits of its authority.

3. *Allegiance and protection are reciprocal ; and protection is the foundation upon which the claim of allegiance rests.* When the foundation is removed, the edifice falls of course.

I readily admit, that there is something in the idea of *native country*, which is intimately connected with the doctrine of allegiance. It is not, however, the spot of earth, upon which the child is born, that connects him with the national society ; but the relation of the child's parents to that society.

In the ordinary concerns of life there is no need of such minute distinctions ; and there is too little discrimination, exercised by the greater part of men, to be able to understand it. Even statesmen are not always wise : and designing men find it their interest to keep up a confusion of ideas upon important subjects. In the present discussion, nevertheless, it is necessary, that I distinctly state to you the *true bond, which connects the child with the body politic.* It is not the inanimate matter of a piece of land, but the *moral relations of his parentage.* Let a child be born within the walls of a church, this does not make him a church member ; but if the parent or parents be in connexion with the church, so is the offspring. Visible society, as it is provided for in the constitution of human nature, naturally seeks to perpetuate its own existence, by conferring upon children the membership of their parents. Each citizen too is supposed to reserve for his offspring the benefits of society. The Governor of the

universe approves of this provision. Thus it is, that the country of the father is that of the child, and not because he happened to be born in its territory. Residence produces an attachment. Education cherishes affection for the scenes of early life; but only *moral relations lay the foundation for moral obligation*. It is the enjoyment of the privileges of society, that lays the foundation for obedience to its authority. It follows from this, that protection being the end of civil government, the sovereign has no other claim upon the allegiance of the subject, than what arises from the protection which he affords. *As is the protection which I ask and receive, so is the fealty which I owe*. If I ask none, I am under no allegiance: If I receive none, I have nothing to return. It is the very essence of despotism to claim authority over me without an equivalent.*

4. *All Nations recognize the Right of Expatriation.*

It has been very common, among the several nations of the earth, to banish from their territories

* “By the law of nature alone, children follow the condition of their fathers, and enter into all their rights. The place of birth produces no change in this particular—for it is not naturally the place of birth that gives rights, but extraction. Children born at sea—out of the country—in the armies of the state,—in the house of its ministers at a foreign court, are reputed native citizens. Every man, born free, may examine whether it be convenient for him to join in the society for which he was destined by his birth. If he finds that it will be of no advantage to him to remain in it, he is at liberty to leave it.”

into other countries, some of their citizens—Writers on public law, admit the right of emigration—Foreigners are naturalized by the several civilized states; and each of these facts implies the principle of expatriation.

The history of distinguished men, in the first ranks of life, who have been exiled from the Grecian states, from the Roman republic, from France, Germany, and from the British dominions, would fill volumes of instructive comment on this theme of discussion. We have very respectable *exiles* before us, in this city, who are living witnesses of the truth, that Great Britain, notwithstanding the claims of perpetual allegiance upon the part of her statesmen, admits the dissolution of native allegiance, and of course contradicts the doctrine of its perpetuity. If *nativity* simply constitutes allegiance, it must be unalterable; because native country never can change: a man is born but once. If *voluntary contract* is the basis of allegiance, I have gained my point; for, in this case, the one party is free to relinquish a connexion in the nature of things conditional, as well as the other. When the connexion is dissolved, protection and allegiance perish together.

I give you the law of nations on this subject, in the words of *Vattel*. “The term *country*, commonly signifies *the state of which one is a member*. In a more confined sense, and more agreeable to its etymology, this term signifies the state, or even more particularly the town, or place where our parents

lived at the moment of our birth. In this sense it is justly said, that our country cannot be changed, and always remains the same, to whatsoever place we remove afterwards—But, as several lawful reasons may oblige a man to choose another country, that is, to become a member of another society; so, when we speak in general of *the duty to our country*, we ought to understand by this term, *the state of which a man is an actual member*; since it is to that he owes it entirely, and in preference to all others.”*

“There are cases, in which *a citizen has an absolute right to renounce his country*, and abandon it entirely. 1. If the citizen cannot procure subsistence in his own country. 2. If the body of the society, or he who represents it, absolutely neglects to fulfil his obligations to a citizen. 3. If the sovereign would establish laws, to which the *pact of Society* cannot oblige a citizen to submit.”†

Of the *third* justifiable cause of expatriation, *M. de Vattel* gives three instances—When religious liberty is violated; when a form of government is altered from freedom to a more arbitrary system; and when a nation has given up, by submission to another, its own independence. “Those who quit their country from a lawful reason, are called emigrants;” and of “*the right of emigration*,” he says in the next sentence,‡ “*This is a NATURAL RIGHT, which is cer-*

* Book I. Chap. 11.

† Book I. Chap. 19.

‡ Sect. 225.

certainly excepted in the pact of society." It is, by the law of nations, a right which cannot be surrendered.

Proceeding upon this principle, all nations have been in the habits of naturalizing foreigners resident among them.* England particularly, as if determined to make apparent to the universe her own inconsistency, has furnished peculiar facilities for *naturalizing seafaring men of all nations*. The short period of two years serving aboard British vessels; marriage with a native in her ports; and voluntary enlistment aboard her men of war, form a sufficient ground for claiming them as subjects. The sovereign of Britain, while he denounces as a traitor, every native of his empire found in arms against him, forces to fight against his own country, the native of whatever nation; and, as if determined to claim, what is most unreasonable and tyrannical, within the compass of human thought, he compels to the battle in the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, American emigrants naturalized, even since the declaration of the present war. The plain language of English royal proclamations, illustrated by the practice of British officers, is, "all the states upon earth must *allow* emigrations to Britain, but must *prohibit* emigrations from Britain to them: the natives of our own soil, and those of other countries, whom we naturalize, shall be our slaves for ever;

* "A nation may grant to a stranger the quality of a citizen, by admitting him to the body of the political society. This is called *naturalization*." *Vattel*, Sect. 214.

but let no other commonwealth dare to protect a naturalized foreigner.”*

* Notwithstanding this exclusive claim, of prohibiting emigration, and encouraging naturalization, assuils her own convenience, Great Britain gives to her subjects, those reasons which require the exercise of the *natural and unalienable right of expatriation*. She violates, in every instance, the PACT OF SOCIETY. 1. She does not afford to industry and enterprize, similar encouragement to that which is given in America. For the means of a comfortable subsistence, thousands are constrained to emigrate: others expatriate themselves, to improve a condition already comfortable; and a much greater number would follow the example, could they command the means of transportation to the hospitable shores of Columbia.

2. The British Government does not fulfil its obligations to the citizen, in governing them by equal laws. The scale upon which the representation is graduated, prevents freemen from giving their suffrages for those who make the laws: and they have of course, a right to remove to a country, in which society is organized upon more liberal principles.

3. Religion is violated, and pious men are placed under political disqualification, and forced to support a system of faith and worship, to which they cannot as honest and good men give their assent. To the corrupt establishment they are compelled to *give the title of all*.

A very large proportion of the population, and the most religious part of it too, in England and in Scotland, is among the dissenters from the national system of worship; and in Ireland, there is not probably one out of ten who belongs to the established church.

We have heard in this country, of the claims of Irish Catholics for emancipation; but the reason of rejecting their claim is not generally known. It is not from any dislike that the high churchmen have to the Roman religion; but from their hatred and fear of the Protestant dissenters. The watchmen of the political religion of England, now stand with the *Sacramental Test* in their hand, to guard the passage to power. The Independents, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the whole body of Protestant dis-

5. *The Right of Expatriation appears from the absurdity of the doctrine of perpetual fealty to the place of nativity.*

In the decision of this question, every man of piety has an interest. However few the men who reason in order that they may understand; and examine moral subjects in order that they may discharge their duty, there are still some, I trust, who would rather suffer on the spot which gave them birth, than leave it for ever, if by so doing they must violate the laws of morality, and sin against their God.

Upon the principle which I am opposing, sad, sad indeed, would be the condition of man. The child is pinned down in the place of his nativity as in a prison, and unto its local authorities he is for ever in thralldom. The African and the Hindoo dare not leave his country for another. The Frenchman and the Spaniard must never throw off allegiance to Louis and to Ferdinand. To the Prince Regent of England, the emigrant must continue in subjection, although he, in an unhappy hour, has perjured himself, in disclaiming his authority, and becoming a naturalized citizen of this republic. And by the same rule of obligation to the place of birth, the authorities of Connecticut extend to many citizens of New-York; the local jurisdiction of every corpo-

senters, are the objects of opposition. The late bishop of London, *Randolph*, avowed his enmity, and threatened to suppress them in his diocese.

Is not this a reason for exercising the right of expatriation?

ration of a city or a village perpetually binds every one born within their respective limits. According to this morality, my hearers, you are guilty of transgression, for having left the township in which you drew the first breath ; and in order to avoid further guilt, you must return whence you came, and leave behind you the wives and the children you have gotten in this city ; for here, they must remain until they retire to the tomb. You must, instead of encouraging a free and honourable intercourse among men of all nations and kingdoms, in order to make them live as one great rational family of the same blood ; instead of encouraging a rivalry in equity and honour among the nations, and a spirit of personal freedom and generous feeling among the natives of every clime and kindred—instead of this, you must require that man be chained to his birth-place ; that sullenness, and non-intercourse, and jealousy, and hatred be cherished ; and that society be cut up into minute sections, with feelings and with views graduated upon the puny scale of counties and of townships. Then will Aristocracy perpetuate her dominion, and Despotism horribly smile from her bloody but triumphant car.

The absurdity of this doctrine is so obvious to the christian, that I am astonished to find among the professed followers of my Redeemer any of its advocates. The man who inculcates perpetual allegiance to the place of birth, assuredly calculates largely upon the amount of human ignorance and folly ; he ventures far upon the slavish feelings of his

partisans; but he does little credit to his own discernment or benevolence. I cannot but infer, that God has bestowed a scanty supply of brains upon the man that denies the right of expatriation; unless indeed by a course of uncommen depravity, he has himself destroyed the finer fibres of the heart. Far different from his, is the morality of the christian religion.

6. *With the scriptural argument, I close my defence of a man's right to choose his country.*

The scriptures inform us that God gave the earth to the children of men. It was his will and command, that it should be peopled from one pair. *God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.** But this order could not be executed, unless the children should emigrate from the place of their nativity, settle in other countries, and form new societies. There is, moreover, no provision made in the scriptures, for keeping the colonies in perpetual subjection to the parent state. This would make the whole world subject to one unwieldy despotism. Upon the contrary, we are assured, that when religion prevails over all the earth, there shall still be distinct *nations, which Satan shall deceive no more;*† there shall still be distinct kingdoms—even the kingdoms of this world, *that shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.* In conformity to this principle, the Governor of the universe.

* Gen. i. 28.

† Rev. xx. 3.

at an early age, when men formed the plan of adhering together in one great and corrupt society, performed a miracle to prevent the evil; and, *so the Lord scattered them abroad from thence, upon the face of all the earth.** Instead of permitting the sovereign of every country, to deceive the subject with claims of perpetual allegiance, God commanded Abram to *expatriate* himself. The father of the faithful obeyed, and left his native country. In vain would the kings of the Canaanites claim, as bound to serve them, the descendants of Abram, born in their territories. *Jacob* removed with his family to Egypt; and even there, notwithstanding the power of the monarchy, they claimed the right of being considered as a distinct people, and of emigrating at their pleasure from the land of bondage. The proclamations of the Prince of Britain would have passed for morality at the court of *Pharaoh*; but *Moses*, without *fearing the wrath of the king*, said unto him, *Let my people go.†* The tyrant ultimately suffered the punishment of his crimes, when he attempted to reclaim as native subjects, the Israelitish emigrants. *Pharaoh*, and his host, his chosen captains also, were drowned in the Red Sea.

Moses did not offend the laws of morality, although in despite of *native allegiance*, he invited *Hobab* to expatriate himself from *Midian*, and accept of naturalization in the commonwealth of Israel. *Come thou with us, and we will do thee good—Leave us*

* Gen. xi. 8

† Exod. v. 1, &c

*not, I pray thee—and it shall be, if thou go with us, that what goodness the Lord shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee.**

I will not pursue this discussion further. I trust I have already sufficiently vindicated the principle upon which, I myself, in common with many of my hearers, and of my fellow-citizens in New-York, have acted. The principle upon which, the ministers of religion must, in many instances act, in conformity to the command of the Prince of the kings of the earth, *Go ye into all nations—preach the gospel to every creature; and lo, I am with you, even unto the end of the world*—THE PRINCIPLE OF EXPATRIATION.

There are, I feel and acknowledge, many tender ties to bind us to our *native* country. We cherish, in fond recollection, the scenes and the partners of our youthful days. We revere the land of our fathers, and the place of their sepulchres. We look back on the friends that we have left behind: we desire their welfare: we cultivate their correspondence; and we are not ashamed to call them brethren. If we have left the national society, and have thrown off allegiance to their rulers, we count it no dishonour to have been born in a territory, where arts, and science, and literature, and heroism, and patriotism abound. Even now, I can gladly transport myself on fancy's wings to my native hills. I

* Numb. x. 29—32.

would still listen to the music of the lark, to the bleating of the flocks, and to the reaper's song ; and I would close the day, in the bosom of a peaceful family, with a solemn hymn of thanksgiving to the Lord. I would still gaze on the lofty rock, where the eagle builds her nest ; admire at a distance, the cloud-capt cliffs of *Benmore*, and count the foaming billows of the Atlantic, rolling among the basaltic pillars of *Staffa*, along the classic shores of *Iona*,* to the bold promontories at the mouth of *Lochleven*. I bless my native country, and take pride in all the excellency of her sons. Others too, feel towards their native place, as I do. But yet, my brethren, on a question of morality, truth must decide. Conscience, and not fancy, must make the application of God's law.

I have frequently felt surprise, at the influence of national feelings over the moral principles of men of talents and of virtue. Some men of that description, men too, of quick sensibility, of high and honourable feelings, have been seen listening to discussions, which, in *denying the right of transferring allegiance*, charged themselves with perjury. For, if fealty be unalterable, the oath of naturalization is a falsehood. There is one remarkable part of the character of the sons of Britain, which is worthy of imitation by the children of Columbia. It is their attachment to country. It is often extravagant in the former, and it is misplaced when directed to the society which

* *Icolmkill*.

they have left, more than to that of which they have become members ; and especially, when it embraces the guilty crown of the kingdom : but it is in itself an honourable principle : alas ! it is too feeble, in the hearts of those American citizens, who admire the moral order and political machinery of Great Britain, more than they seek to preserve the integrity of their own republican institutions.

I have not made these remarks on misplaced attachment to country, with a view to apply them to those emigrants from the dominions of the British king, who belong to this congregation. No. To you, my brethren, they are not applicable. In common with those christians in your native country, and in this, the country of your choice, who are bound with you in the same faith, and in the same covenant, you embrace, as a part of your christian doctrine, the principle of expatriation. You disclaim, by the solemnities of religion, allegiance to the corrupt, political, and ecclesiastical system of British misrule. That *was* your country. It is so no more. To our brethren ; yea, to every man in that empire, we wish health and happiness, and eternal life. But this country, although we see and lament the evils which appertain to its inhabitants and to its government, this country, is now become our own. Here we have voluntarily settled. Here we have married our wives. Here we have our homes. Here we have our children placed *as olive-plants around our table* ; and here we expect to leave our *flesh to rest in hope*, when the last breath shall depart from our nostrils, and the spirit shall re-

turn to God. To this country, during the present struggle to maintain the rights of expatriation, to preserve the rights of the stranger, who expects not in vain to find hospitality—To this country, we wish success in the present contest. We pray for a happy termination of the strife, and for a speedy restoration of the blessings of peace, *that in the peace thereof we may have peace.*

Having thus vindicated the most doubtful part of the cause of America in the present war, and given evidence of its justness, I go on,

II. To show the Principles upon which the War may be lawfully prosecuted.

Besides the question of right to make war upon an offending nation, there are many considerations to be taken into the account of its moral character. Governments, as well as individuals, have not unfrequently displayed pride, indiscretion, and malevolence, in contending for their unquestionable rights; and have thereby given a character of inexpediency and criminality to a contest which might have been conducted by better men upon moral principles. Nor is the fact to be concealed, that the virtuous part of a community are justified in the sight of God and their country, in keeping aloof from a contest, however good the cause, if moral evil be made essential to the mode of carrying it on. We must not do evil that good may come of it. If the terms, upon which admission into the army, like the *British*

sacramental test,* be absolutely sinful, it becomes a duty, even when the cause of war is just, to reject the terms, and of course to withhold a support which cannot otherwise be afforded.

It is evidently, therefore, both the duty and the interest of those who are placed at the head of a nation, to take order, that the wars, which, by the injustice of others, they are compelled to wage, be prosecuted upon equitable principles. If it should be the lot of a conscientious man to live in a belligerent state, which wages a war, *just* in its causes, but *iniquitous* in the mode by which it is conducted, he has only, when the evil is beyond his remedy, to withhold his personal agency, and to pray that the *cause* may, notwithstanding the sins of men, be prospered by the Lord. No iniquity of the instrument can justify the dereliction of a good cause. Those, of course, cannot be esteemed as virtuous members of any community, who, under the plea of improvidence, of weakness or mismanagement, upon the part of rulers, not only strive to prevent the success of a lawful war, but also with design to increase the national embarrassment, deny the justness of the contest. With this distinction, obvious to every man, I shield from the charge of insincerity those conscientious men who may disapprove of the present administration, and the conduct of the war, while I make no apology for him, who, devoid of patriotism and virtue, calls in question the legitimacy of the

* See page 71

contest as it now exists, and recommends submission to the enemy—I make no apology for him, who strives to prevent the success of his country in the present strife. I leave him to the comforts of his own reflections, knowing, as I do, that whatever may be his motives, they cannot command the approbation of his country, of his cotemporaries in other lands, of posterity, of his conscience, or of his God. With him, therefore, I do not stoop to argue the question. To others I say, let us examine, upon moral principles, the mode of prosecuting the present war.

I am not the eulogist of men in power; neither *do I give flattering titles to man*: I love the country of my choice, and I pray to God for the prosperity and success of its arms. I lament whatever of indecision, and imbecility, and improvidence, and mismanagement has appeared in the halls of legislation, in the executive councils, in the leaders of our armies. I could fervently wish, and devoutly pray, for more firmness, and wisdom, and action, and for more extensive resources in men and in money for the safety of the nation. But I would not dispute, and embarrass, and threaten, for the purpose of producing an effect, for which I should afterwards blame those who were irresolute enough to listen to my opposition. I would not strive to bring about an evil for the sake of condemning it, and injuring the country. I would not *tempt to sin*, for the sake of *triumphing over the fallen*.

I submit to your consideration the three following principles; *belligerent communities are always to be considered, each as one body—in war, the nation, as such, is the proper object of attack—the change, which humanity has already introduced into the modes of warfare, should not be diminished, but extended.*

I shall now explain these principles, and apply them to the mode in which this war is conducted.

1. *In a state of War, we must consider each Community as one Body.*

However extensive an empire, however numerous its colonies and dependencies, organized into one society, and subject to the same sovereign power, when that sovereign has undertaken war, the whole empire is called upon to bear a part in its prosecution, and the other party in the contest, has a right to consider it as one body. In a just war, the place of attack is a question of expediency: and the most vulnerable point presents itself as the most eligible.* The skill of the General in battle is displayed, in arranging his forces, and in selecting the point of attack, so as with the least exertion and danger to do the greatest possible injury to the hostile battalions. If he besieges a city, he will select the most vulnerable spot, and there strike the blow. It is worse than trifling to allege, that this is pusilla-

* See pages 126, and 132.

nimous or immoral. The sole object of a just war is to make the enemy feel the evils of his own injustice, and by his sufferings dispose him to amend his ways. He must therefore be attacked upon the most accessible quarter.

I have already established the justness of the present war. Taking that for granted, I now inquire into the best manner of giving it effect. The circumstances of the case leave no manner of doubt upon this subject. Great Britain, separated from us by the wide Atlantic, exposes no point, upon which the United States can reach her, except her colonies and her shipping. The Canadas and her commerce present the proper objects of attack. On both these points, she feels; and you may judge of her feelings from the fact, that those who feel with her, and for her, among ourselves, feel most upon these very subjects. Her fleets and her armies, those instruments of annoyance to others, are of no use but the protection of her colonies and commerce. By attacking and conquering them, the citizens of America may acquire, and have acquired, renown; but it is by capturing that which they protect, and for which alone they are supported, that the enemy can be brought to feel, to reason, and do justice.

Upper Canada, particularly, presented to the United States the most eligible theatre for the contest. It was the most accessible part of the enemy's territory,—the possession of it would prove the defense of an extended frontier from the ravages of the

too, and from Indian barbarity—and it might be held as an equivalent until, for the sake of its restoration, the enemy would be constrained to do justice. These considerations put the *policy* of attacking it beyond a doubt. And the *equity* of it necessarily follows from the justness of the war itself. Do you doubt this? Show me wherefore, and I will answer you. Set your arguments in array, and my reply is at hand. “The inhabitants of Canada have committed no offence.” Is this your argument? Who then has offended? The Soldier, the Sailor? No. The Minister, the Regent? Will you then despatch a messenger of private vengeance to assassinate the offending sovereign, rather than attack his dominions, and his colonies, and his troops, and his ships of war? But you are mistaken. The Canadians have offended. They have made a common cause with their sovereign. *In him who represents them they have offended.* Let them peacefully distinguish themselves from him, and remain as *non-combatants* in the possession and use of their property—and these innocents shall then be unmolested. It is not against the unoffending Canadians, it is against the king’s troops, and the king’s fleet, and against the king’s territories, that the United States wage this war on the waters and the shores of Erie, Champlain, and Ontario. And you, too, I suspect, from the nature of your remark, do not so much dispute the *legitimacy* of this part of the war, as you dislike the whole cause. Sympathy with the Canadians has frequently been affected as a benevolent method of aiming

a side-blow at the administration of the government. This may be considered as good policy; but it partakes not of the candour of religion. The British empire, like the human body, has many members, and all the members being many, are one body. In a state of war, an attack upon any member is lawful. In a moral point of view, it makes no difference whether the blow falls upon the capitol or the colony. The whole nation is one body.

2. *The Nation only is the proper Object of War.*

Humanity prescribes laws for belligerent communities. The evils of war are necessarily great; and they ought not to be unnecessarily increased. Private persons and property, whose injury cannot affect the controversy, should remain unmolested. The monuments of the fine arts are respected by civilized nations; and none but barbarians will designedly destroy elegant edifices or libraries. The plunder of hamlets and villages, the conflagration of private dwellings and barns, can have no other effect than multiplying private misery, and producing higher degrees of exasperation: for the rule of humanity, in a necessary war, is to inflict no injury except what will affect the nation as a body politic, and thus subserve the proper end of warfare.

3. Several changes favourable to humanity, on the mode of conducting war, have already obtained; *and, such ought to be extended.*

It is highly honourable to the government of this republic, that a proffer has been made to the enemy of *an armistice*, ever since the commencement of hostilities, upon condition that he should desist, by sea and by land, from the practices which called for an appeal to the sword; and that a proposal has been made, upon terms of reciprocity, for repaying to injured individuals the losses which might by them be incurred during the continuance of the contest. It is equally dishonourable, on the part of the foe, to refuse acceding to such proposals. On him of course descends the guilt of every injury.

According to modern usage in christian nations, unauthorized individuals are not permitted with impunity to fall upon an enemy. Secret means of annoyance, such as poison and assassination, are discarded. The persons of those who do not carry arms, and even of retainers to an army, are in safety. Prisoners are not enslaved, but treated with respect. Officers are dismissed on their parole. Predatory excursions, and pillage of every kind, are discountenanced; and the horrors of war accordingly mitigated.* This reform has been effected principally through the influence of the christian religion: a religion distinguished by its harmony with the most correct principles of national law. It ought to be extended in its benign influence to other practices, still admitted by the law of nations; but highly

* See on this subject, Paley, Martens, Vattel, Bynkershock, Pauli, and Moser.

injurious to morality. It ought to be extended to the practice of privateering, and to that which gives origin to privateering ; the practice of capturing *private property* of any kind upon the ocean, by *public armed vessels*, whether in peace or in war. There are many cogent reasons for opposing the practice of taking private property on the high seas. It is contrary to the golden rule, “do unto others as you would that they should do unto you.” It is robbing men of the fruits of their industry ; for it allows them no equivalent for their property. It cherishes avarice, already sufficiently stimulated by commercial cupidity. It entirely destroys much property, without advantage to any one. It endangers and sacrifices many valuable lives. It retards the progress of civilization. It increases the burden and expenditure of nations, by giving occasion for fleets of armed vessels, for defence and pillage. It is in the present condition of the world, the principal source of dispute and strife, of national quarrels, and of public wars. Therefore is it devoutly to be wished, that pious men, in every country, should, with one consent, set their faces against so great an evil ; and support, with every exertion in their power, those able civilians among the nations, who are endeavouring, on this very head, to meliorate the code of public law.* The only ground upon which

* There is some reason to hope, that the time is approaching, when the principle for which I contend, will be in fact admitted as a part of the law of nations: not simply as it respects *privateers* ; but also as it respects *public armed vessels*.

I justify this country in pursuing this practice, is that of visiting upon the enemy, the evil which his injustice merits. That ground is sufficient. It is the ground upon which rests the equity of the war

Privateering, I acknowledge, is more obviously wrong, than captures of merchantmen by national ships of war. It is that kind of *the invasion of private right*, which is most extensive in its injurious effects, most level to the capacities of ordinary minds, most calculated to excite the aversion of christian sensibility, most pernicious to the general morality of the community, by multiplying the number of adventurers, who seek and share the plunder of unoffending fellow-men: but the evil, the radical evil, lies *in the invasion of private right at all*.

To the total abolition of this practice, I see in the state of the nations no formidable barrier, except what is presented by the policy of Great Britain. It is her navy that plays the criminal game in times of peace and war. It is reasonable, however, to expect, that during the present repose of the nations, they will ask one another the question, How long shall England be permitted to enjoy the exclusive commerce and dominion of the ocean? Shall it be for ever? It is reasonable to expect they will devise means, in concert, for asserting *the freedom of the seas*.

I know that this is necessary to public justice. I know it is necessary to a permanent peace in the world. I know it is promised in the word of God. I know it will be brought to pass. In despite of the example, and the influence of Great Britain, I find throughout Europe and America, an increasing dislike to the practice of *private plunder* on the ocean.

Christian sensibility, in this city, and throughout the country, is averse from privateering. Some American civilians, and among others, Mr. CHANCELLOR KENT of this state, (a man who, while Chief Justice, ably vindicated the christian character of the commonwealth, in affirming the decision that *blasphemy against the Saviour is a crime*,) have protested against privateering. It would be doing injustice to their intellect and their patriotism, to say, that while condemning it here, they justify it on the part of

itself. War under the best form is an evil—a necessary evil. *Non enim est ulla defensio contra vim unquam obtanda, sed nonnunquam est necessaria.**

the enemy; that, while condemning the practice of privateering, they approve of the principle of plunder by public armed vessels; that, while condemning the invasion of private right, as a weapon of war, they allow the morality of it in times of peace. I rather class them with those writers on public law, who, while they admit that it is among the usages of nations, desire to have the code of national law altered and amended. I rather class them with those distinguished civilians of France, who adorned the reign of the Emperor Napoleon, by raising up that imperishable monument of legal talent, the Civil Code, still the law of the nation whose throne he has abdicated. I had rather class them with the framers of the *Treaty of Tilsit*, that remarkable instrument, which, as we learn from the note of the *Duke of Bassano*, Paris, April 25, 1812, to the *Chancellor of Russia*, asserts the same principle. In that note are the following very liberal and correct assertions. “His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, has acknowledged at Tilsit, the principle—that the nations, in the full enjoyment of their rights, might give themselves up freely to the exercise of their industry—that the independence of their flag should be inviolable, and its protection a reciprocal duty of the one towards the other.”

AZUNI, on *Maritime Law*, adduces facts to show, that the nations in general, are approaching a state, in which the conventional code of public law will provide, That “*in future no merchant-vessel shall be stopped or seized, unless taken with articles really contraband.*” and MARTENS gives to our own country, the credit of being first in this work of reform. “In the Treaty of Commerce between the king of Prussia and the United States of America, 1785, Art. 23, the first example has been given of a convention, in virtue of which, all merchant and trading vessels employed in the exchange of the productions of different places, shall pass freely, and without molestation.”

* Cicero

CONCLUSION.

I now bring this discourse to a close, with a *summary* of my reasons, for urging upon all classes, a cordial support of the defensive measures, which may be *morally and constitutionally* employed, by those, who, in divine providence, have the management of the war committed into their hands. If any means proposed, should appear to be unconstitutional, let those, who are friendly to the instrument which binds these states together in one great republican confederation, expose their inconsistency by liberal arguments; but let them still support their country in the contest. If any of these measures should be *immoral*, let Christians avoid *touching, tasting, or handling the unclean thing*; but let them still love their country; and in every thing consistent with a good conscience sanctified by the Lord, promote the cause in which the nation is embarked against a powerful and unjust enemy.

If negotiation should fail to secure a speedy peace, the dangers of the country call for unanimity in the strife of blood and battle. In that case, supporting the war will be the means of preserving *the union of the states*: and this is unquestionably desirable. Whatever mistaken individuals may say of the collision of interests, and the rivalry existing between the north and the south, the east and the west; every state, every part of this extensive em-

pire, has a deep interest in perpetuating the *federal* connexion. It is the means of preventing those collisions and jealousies from coming to an open rupture—it is the means of internal peace and friendship—it is the means of promoting their commerce, their manufactures, and their agriculture—it is the means of cultivating, by suitable encouragement, the sciences and the liberal arts—it is the means of preserving unimpaired the liberties of the people, and guaranteeing the forms of their democratic policy—it is the means of defence against foreign enemies, waiting to divide, and anxious to destroy—it is the means of securing religious liberty, together with the purity, the peace, and the growth of our churches. The several religious denominations, already weakened by dissention, would become still more weak, if the parts of each ecclesiastical body situated in the different states, were cut asunder by political distinctions, which must turn brother against brother. Such a state of things would prevent all liberal intercourse among Christians, scattered over this land from north to south; and if, by renewing in America the local favouritism and the political priestcraft of the old world, some particular clergymen might rise to a higher eminence, true religion would suffer by the change; and the more ingenuous and humble men, would become more limited in their influence and usefulness.

I would urge the support of the war, because I earnestly long for a permanent peace. You know the enemy. His claims will rise, by his successes;

and fall, in proportion to his defeats. The more he suffers, the more will he be disposed to relinquish the contest. The greater his danger, the sooner will he come to an accommodation. By consistency and unanimity, America might have finished this war as soon as it had commenced. It is only by affecting the fears of the foe, that he can be made to listen to the voice of equity.

I would recommend the support of this war, because it is just. The United States ask for nothing, but what they ought to have; what it is lawful for the enemy to give; what is in its very nature moral—the protection of property, and personal liberty. I pray for success to these righteous claims: I pray for courage to the warrior, and for success to the armaments by which the plea is urged, because the cause is just—because it is necessary to the repose of the world—because God has promised that this cause shall universally prevail.

In offering these prayers, I know that they are in unison with the prayers of my brethren, even in the country with which this nation is at war—with the prayers of all Christians, who say, from the heart, "*thy kingdom come.*" I speak not of *forms*, dictated by courts, and used by the priests, whom the kings of the earth keep in pay to overawe their subjects. I speak of prayers, dictated by the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ. To such prayers, my petitions, for the ultimate success of the American claims, are in unison. Should you travel among the nations, and take the

suffrages of the saints every where on earth, you would not find one single-hearted Christian, who would refuse his assent to these principles—*the sea should be free to all honest enterprize—personal liberty should be secured—and every man should be permitted to pursue his lawful industry, wheresoever he chooses to take up his abode.* These are the principles for which this nation contends by the sword; and therefore do I pray to the Almighty God, for their full success.—AMEN.

THE ENDS FOR WHICH GOD IN HIS PROVIDENCE
PERMITS THE EXISTENCE OF THIS WAR.

SERMON V.

*Come, and let us declare in Zion the work of the Lord
our God. Jer. li. 10.*

THEY, whose lot it is to live in the midst of revolutions and wars, are constrained to be the witnesses of much misery and sorrow. Where ignorance and tyranny prevail, the humane have only to mourn in silence over their calamities, without even the small consolation of proclaiming to the world, the evils which they see or endure. Wheresoever, however, liberty secures the right of expressing one's thoughts, and especially where true religion begets a becoming magnanimity, men will always be found to relate the tale of woe, and to declare their opinions of the *causes and consequences* of present sufferings. It is, moreover, to be expected, that in such cases, some diversity of sentiment will obtain among the most unbiassed and virtuous. The complexness of

public affairs—the imperfection of knowledge—the peevishness and the passions of the heart, give us reason to believe, had we not the lights of history to assure us of the fact, that, without any uncommon degrees of depravity, men will *dispute* about the several interesting concerns of social life.

The sad experience of the churches, and particularly of the *Reformed*, proclaims the danger to their sons, which arises from the tumults and the changes of political empire. During the concussion of nations, many professors of religion lose their reason and their faith: and it requires living principle in connexion with *the rock of ages*, to prevent being tossed off, and buried in the earthquake. Therefore do we invite christians, during the present struggle of the nations, *to come and declare in Zion the work of the Lord our God*.

The invitation was originally given by the prophet Jeremiah, in view of judgments destined to overthrow the Chaldean government. It was to *the wars* of the Medes and Persians, he gave the name of *the work of the Lord*, which deserves to be *declared in Zion*, the church of Jesus Christ. The narrative of this case, affords an instructive lesson. It is found in chap. 50, & 51. Jeremiah, who makes the declaration, deserves to be held up to view as a model for christian ambassadors, in midst of scenes of war. He was descended from the house of *Aaron*, and of course a *priest*, as well as a *prophet*. By early piety, a remarkable discernment of the signs

of the times, an affecting tenderness, and by an unyielding firmness and integrity, he was qualified for the duties of an arduous ministry; and, although he longed for a release from his labours, and his very body, insomuch as to curse the day of his birth, he was continued, for the instruction of the church, to old age upon earth. His faithfulness provoked the resentment of the great; and among those whom he laboured to instruct and to save, as he would not flatter, he had few, if any friends. They forced him reluctantly to minister to them in Egypt after the fall of Jerusalem: and, even there, instead of consulting their prejudices, he freely proclaimed unwelcome truths. Persecuted by men, his only consolation was from heaven: and his happiness on earth consisted in doing his duty. We do not know which to admire most, his magnanimity, or disinterestedness: for when *Nebuzaraddan*, the Commander in Chief of the Chaldean armament, offered him an establishment in Babylon, he preferred continuing with his afflicted brethren, who had never treated him with the kindness or esteem due to his worth.

This weeping prophet sympathized in the sufferings of a people, injured and invaded by the foe. Many of them were already in captivity. He beheld the noble edifices of the capital smoking in ruins. He dropped a tear over the fallen glory; and turning his eyes to the east, over the mighty waters of Euphrates, to Babylon, the enemy of his country, now in the full tide of successful war, he

exclaimed, *O thou that dwellest upon many waters, abundant in treasures, thine end is come, and the measure of thy covetousness.** Jeremiah committed to writing the predicted judgments, and sent them by the hands of Seraiah to Babylon, with orders, that when he read them to the captive Israelites, they should be fastened to a stone, and thrown into the Euphrates, as a symbol of the demolition of Chaldean greatness. While predicting these judgments of war from the Lord, destined to overthrow that mighty empire, he invited the saints, in the words of my text, “*Come, let us declare in Zion the work of the Lord our God.*”

War is, in a certain sense, the work of the Lord—As such it ought to be understood and declared by a religious people.

Both these assertions I shall endeavour to confirm and apply, and shall then conclude this subject.

I. *All wars are, in a certain sense, the work of the Lord our God.*

It is not, in its own nature, pleasing to the Deity, to contemplate either the evil passions or the sufferings of men. God is not to be viewed in the light of an arbitrary and capricious tyrant, that sports with the miseries of his creatures. *He is of purer eyes*

* Jer. li. 13.

*than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity.** Nevertheless, he not only admits, but, in some instances, requires war: and on account of its effects, he brings it to pass, as under existing circumstances, suited to the nature of his government over such creatures as the sinful children of men. *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?†* *Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?‡*

The Providence of God extends to every event—war is particularly specified—and the wars of this age of the world, are pointed out in the prophetic history.

1. *The Providence of God extends to every Event which comes to pass.*

Provision was made, in the counsel of his own will, before any part of creation was called into existence, for all that the Lord doeth with his creatures in time or through eternity. A man of understanding purposeth beforehand what he shall do: it argues imperfection of intellect or of power, or else mutation of disposition, to act contrary to previous resolution: omniscience, omnipotence, and immutability assure us, that God *worketh all things after the counsel of his own will;*§ and as he willed what he shall himself perform, his agency extends over matter and mind to every event, from the colouring of a filament

* Hab. i. 13. † Gen. xviii. 25. ‡ Amos iii. 6

§ Eph. i. 11.

of hair, to the overturning of a world. *The very hairs of your head are all numbered.**

2. *War is particularly specified* in several parts of the sacred volume, as a work of God's Providence over human affairs. "Wherefore *it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord what he did* in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon: and at the stream of the brook that goeth down to the dwelling of Ar, and lieth on the border of Moab."†

I shall illustrate this doctrine by a passage from sacred history, which is very applicable to the several inquiries, which piety would suggest upon hearing that war is the work of the Lord our God.

Ahab king of Israel proposed to *Jehoshaphat* king of Judah, an alliance, for the purpose of waging war against the Syrians, of which the latter accepted; but expressed a desire to consult the prophets respecting the nature and ends of the contest.‡ *Jehoshaphat*, with all his failings, which although numerous, appear to have chiefly proceeded from the mildness and indecision of his character, was a pious man, who revered the word of the Lord. *Ahab* was of an opposite character, but made it a part of his policy to keep a numerous ministry depending upon the royal bounty; because, by that very dependence he might calculate upon their influence, in the community, to favour his plans of ambition and tyranny.

Luke xii. 7. † Num. xxi. 14. ‡ 1 Kings xxii. 1--5.

He accordingly summoned a council of prophets, which was attended by about four hundred. They knew the inclination of the king of Israel: they were not so well acquainted with the will of the king of heaven: and they did not hesitate to give, what their patron expected, the sanction of their religion to his belligerent proposals.* He was gratified; but his ally, suspecting the character of *Ahab's* prophets, was not satisfied: he inquired for some teacher of divine truth, worthy of more confidence. There was one of that description at hand. *Micaiah* the son of *Imlah*, was well known in Samaria for his plainness and integrity; but, as might be expected, of such a character, that he was not in favour with the court. Though constrained to respect his virtues, they disliked him for his unyielding disposition. *I hate him*, said *Ahab*, *for he does not prophesy good concerning me, but evil.*†

It was the policy of the king of Israel, however, not to displease or disappoint a man upon whose co-operation he calculated in the Syrian war; and, in order to gratify *Jehoshaphat*, *Micaiah* was admitted to the royal presence. Enrobed in state apparel, the two allied monarchs sat upon thrones, before the gate of Samaria, receiving, in the presence of the populace, the homage of the more courtly prophets, when the son of *Imlah* approached. He came along with a trusty messenger from *Ahab*, who had previously solicited a favourable reply from him to the

* See verse 6.

† Verse 9.

proposition of the kings. The prophet made no stipulations, save expressing a determination to do his duty. When he spake, he predicted the fall of Ahab in the battle.*

Enraged at such boldness, the king ordered the prophet instantly to prison, to *be fed upon bread of affliction, and water of affliction*, until he should himself return from the field of battle, whither he speedily directed his troops to march. *And Micaiah said, if thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken at all by me.*† The fact verified the prediction. War was waged; and Ahab, in despite of his cowardly disguise, fell in battle.

The words of the prophet, before the gates of Samaria, explain in what sense, war waged, by sinful men influenced by a spirit of delusion, may, nevertheless, be said to be of the Lord. *I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead!—And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him—I will go forth, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning you.*‡

* Verses 9—17.

† Verse 26.

‡ Verses 19—23.

From this account, it appears, that Ahab and his prophets, seduced by an evil spirit, voluntarily acted and sinned—that the Governor of the world permitted their transgressions, and employed their actions to answer his righteous purposes—that the contest at Ramoth-gilead was predestinated, predicted, and brought to pass, by the Lord our God.

3. The wars, which are, in this age of the world, carried on in Christendom, are peculiarly pointed out in prophecy as the work of God.

That part of sacred history, from which I have taken my text, very readily suggests to every one, familiar with the Bible, a portion of New Testament prediction which justifies this remark. I refer to the outpouring of the *sixth* Apocalyptical vial. It is the intimate connexion between these two passages of Scripture that induced the selection of my text.

The prophecy of Jeremiah, respects the downfall of the ancient Babylon. This is “the work of the Lord to be declared in Zion.” The event took place under Belshazzar, and was effected by the united armies of Darius the Mede and Cyrus Prince of Persia, conducted by the latter, the greatest general of his own time.

Media and Persia, both lay to the east of Judea and of Chaldea, and on this account, a Jew, writing in Palestine about the affairs of Babylon, must consider the well-known destroyers of Chaldean great-

Cyrus and his uncle Cyaxares, as *the kings of*
 . For twenty-one years, the empire of the
 was disputed between these kings and the rulers of Babylon. It was by stratagem they at last succeeded. The Euphrates, which runs through that city, was diverted at immense labour from its channel; and when the waters abated, the Medes and the Persians marched in and took possession.* This explains the words of John the Divine. *The sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.*†

The *sixth* vial designates the period under which we live. I shall not here repeat what I formerly said in your hearing, in my LECTURES ON THE PERIOD

* "After a siege of nearly two years, Cyrus at last succeeded in taking Babylon. Understanding that a great annual festival was to be kept at Babylon, he sent up a party of his men to the castle, leading to the great lake, with orders to break down the bank, and turn the whole current into the lake. Towards evening he opened the head of the trenches on both sides the river above the city. In the interim, getting all his forces together, he posted one part of them at the place where the river entered the city, and the other where it came out, with orders to enter as soon as the channel became fordable. By the middle of the night, both parties entered, the one having Gobrias, and the other Gadates, two revolting nobles of Chaldea, for their guides. Both parties met at the palace, surprised the guards, took possession, and slew the king. This account Herodotus and Xenophon both give of the taking of Babylon by Cyrus; and herein they exactly agree with the sacred scriptures."

Prideaux, Vol. I. p. 153—155.

† Rev. xvi. 12.

OF THE VIALS, to prove that we are now under the *sixth*. I take that fact for granted. The *fifth* introduced the reformation. The *seventh* will introduce the millennium. The intervening judgments, on antichristian nations, belong to the *sixth*.

We have shown, that *the unclean spirits* which proceed from Satan, *doing wonders*, seducing the kings of the *Roman Earth*, and even of the whole world to go forth to war—*three unclean spirits like frogs, out of the mouth of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet*, are, the principles of infidelity, of tyranny, and of hypocrisy, supported by philosophists, by European monarchs, and by corrupt ecclesiastics, producing wars, and gathering the nations to their merited judgments. We have shown, that it is the design of heaven, while employing that terrible machinery, as a wo to the kingdom of the man of sin, to destroy the immense resources, which the establishments of the old world draw from their system of foreign colonization, and its dependent commerce. We have shown, that this, the object of the *sixth vial*, began to be accomplished in the American revolution; and that *the waters of Euphrates*, thus diverted from their channel through the midst of Babylon, will continue to flow more and more in another course, until the former channel is dry, and the corrupt establishments of Europe become a more easy prey to “the kings of the east,” the agents of their ruin. Of this vial the present war is a part: and whatever may have been the intention of its instigators and opponents; whatever

the immediate motives of its origin and continuance, it is a part of the grand scheme of Providence, for drying up the waters of the modern or mystic Babylon; and as such, it is in a peculiar sense the work of the Lord our God, which it behoves us both to declare and to explain in Zion. But this leads to another part of my discourse.

II. *We shall show the several ends to be answered by this war, as a work of God's good Providence.*

This theme of discussion recommends itself, in a particular manner, to christian attention. All that love the Lord Jesus Christ, will regard *the doings of his hand. He hath exalted his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all.* Whatever judgment we form of the views and the actions of men in power over the several nations; it is our incumbent duty to study with care the designs of heaven, so far as they are developed in the dispensations of his Providence. *Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden to the hands of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God.**

The war in which our country is engaged, is a part of THE GRAND SCHEME OF GOD'S PROVIDENCE, and requires that we consider it, both as it respects this nation in particular, and as it respects the general family of nations.

* Ps. cxxiii. 2.

We can discover the purposes of the *Deity* respecting us, only by means of his revealed will ; and he reveals himself by his *word*, and his *works*. He hath so ordered it, that we are at war with a great and powerful empire : and, however we may account for the fact, by the contingencies of secondary causes, it is not to be denied, that it comes to pass *according to the purpose of Him, who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will*. He does nothing in vain. The effects produced were intended to be produced ; and by observing these, we learn what he hath designed to accomplish. The present war appears destined by the God of heaven, to answer the purposes of *a judgment—a trial—and, a benefit*.

1. *The War is a Judgment.*

The sins of individual transgressors are not punished to their full amount in this life. At the last day, every man shall receive as his work shall be. But nations do not exist as bodies politic in the world of spirits. Divine Justice lays hold of them accordingly in the present world, and metes out to them their merited punishment. The transgressions of this empire are confessedly numerous ; and in no country upon earth do the sins of different individuals require more, to be taken into the account of the national guilt, than those of the people of the United States ; because in no other country, are the people and the government so completely identified in the constitution and administration of civil power. The

moral character of those who are elected to office, is known to their constituents: their acts, while in office, are the acts of the community which they represent: the offences committed by public men, are, therefore, justly laid to the account of the commonwealth. It is a fact, that we suffer; and had we not sinned, such sufferings would not have befallen us. *Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: for we obeyed not his voice.** We feel our sufferings.

The mind is harassed by anxiety; the body is broken down by the fatigues of warfare: families are separated to meet no more: and the arts, the employments, and the comforts of domestic life, give way to the labours of flight from the scene of danger; to the duties of the camp, and of the field of battle; and to the collection of the scattered fragments of what remains of former treasure.

Property is rapidly changing hands. The Trader sees his ships rotting in the harbour, and become a prey for worms. His capital is without productive employment, and gradually melting away like the April snow. The Manufacturer, the Adventurer, the Sailor, the Soldier, and especially the Public Contractor, is supported or enriched on the public loss. A few years of war, will make many rich men poor, and some poor men wealthy.

* Dan. ix. 14.

To fatigues and vexations, to the dissipation of a military life, to the effects of unhealthy climate and diet, as well as by the sword of battle, many fall as victims, and leave behind them the widow and the fatherless, bereaved and unprotected, to relate the tale of sorrow. Heavy taxation, for the present, and an accumulating national debt for the succeeding generation, are among the evils incident to a contest like this, and in all these sufferings we clearly see the indignation of the Lord. He appointed these evils for national chastisement: and the fact must be proclaimed in Zion as the work of the Lord. It *must* be so, for he hath purposed it: and it *should* be so, for he is holy.

2. *The War is a Trial.*

It would be no less comfortless to ourselves, than ungrateful to a merciful God, were we to consider the evils which he brings upon us *solely* in the light of a punishment. War, like other evils, is ordained for *trial*: and as such, Christians will improve the dispensation. While it corrects for previous and present guilt, it makes proof of the remaining good. Such was the principal character of the afflictions of Job. Such were the sufferings of primitive persecution: and such are, in a great measure, the evils of a nation prosecuting legitimate warfare.

In the present state of this country the community is severely tried, as to the degree of Christian liberality among its members—as to the patriotism of

the rulers and the people—and as to the worth of their free republican institutions.

First. The contest does in fact show where *Christian liberality* is found, and in what degree it exists among its professors. Charity, respecting the different opinions of Christian sects and denominations, has long been a favourite doctrine in this country. Whether it arises from true benevolence, or from indifference to religion itself, remains to be shown. If from true benevolence, it will certainly triumph over political animosities. And the war will make it appear whether these party political distinctions, which have so long and unhappily existed, can be made to yield to Christian attachments to such a degree, as that brother can listen to a brother, and impartially esteem him, and love him still, although of different sentiments respecting the character of the present war. Charity is not limited to a political sect.

Second. The state of the country does also try effectually the degree of *patriotism* which is still to be found in the United States.

It will show how far a man is willing to suffer for his country—How far he is ready to sacrifice views of personal interest or ambition—How far he is prepared to give up with the pride of opinion, suppress the prejudices of party spirit, cast off the trammels of that party machinery, wherewith he has been held in bondage. The country calls for unanimity in repelling and chastising the foe. In the

time of her distress, an ample opportunity is afforded to the hollow-hearted patriot, to revile her, to embarrass her counsels and proceedings, and like Shimei, at *Bahurim*, to curse her as guilty before God, in hopes of rising on her ruins. But this is the time to show the true patriot, of whatever party. His influence and his advice ; his co-operation and support ; his wishes and his prayers, will be offered up for the maintenance of the contest with adequate resources, until victory crown with success the efforts of his country, and procure an honourable and a permanent pacification.

The patriotic statesman, had he personally suffered from his country the greatest injustice, would come, in the present crisis, as *Aristides*, to his rival *Themistocles*, and offer his services, in giving effect to the war, for the good of his country. In vain do they profess christianity, who will permit the pagans of Greece to exhibit greater degrees of disinterestedness under similar circumstances. It is to be hoped, that in this hour of trial, it will be made to appear, that Athenians do not exceed Americans in *patriotism*.

Third. The present war is a trial of our republican institutions.

America gave to the civilized world, the first specimen of a country, great and enterprising, capable of order and prosperity without kings, without nobles, without degrading the lower classes of the community into a state of servitude, and without

making of religion and its ministers, an engine of political power. This fact is known in Europe. It is already admitted every where by men capable of reflection, that republicanism, that a *true Representative Democracy* is the best form of government for a people at peace. But can it endure the shock of war? That is the question which has been answered, by the advocates of arbitrary power, in the negative. That is the interesting question now in trial by this war. If we succeed in this contest, the superiority of our political institutions must be evident to ourselves, and to the whole world. If a government, supported but by half the strength of the nation, without fleets, without armies, and without the wealth which gives sinews to war, dared to declare hostilities; if a republican government, without veteran soldiers, and without experienced generals, is found capable of carrying on a contest with the most powerful nation on earth, a nation skilled in war, at the very *acme* of her greatness and glory, victorious over all her other enemies, with an immense disposable force: and if, under such circumstances, we can procure an honourable peace, then is our freedom secure, then shall we have confidence in one another, and become the admiration of the world.

3. *The War is a Benefit.*

“The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice. Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne. *Zion heard and was glad; and the daughter of Judah re-*

joiced because of thy judgments, O Lord. Rejoice in the Lord, ye righteous; and give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness."*

Whether I shall be able, my christian brethren, to specify the advantages which will flow from this contest or not, I know well that God intends it for good. Whether I shall succeed in convincing you, that the effects which I am about to mention, will in fact follow, or that even when they come to pass, they should be considered as a public benefit, I will not now venture to affirm: but, at all events, the saints are required to *rejoice in his judgments*; and these judgments must, of course, give *cause of joy*. Others may contemplate the prospect before them with gloomy apprehensions. Let them cheerlessly cast their eye upon the evil, and fall into despondence. Let them fret, and abuse, and curse the hand that smites them; but, I know *that all things shall work together for good*. Walking by faith, our eye is directed to him that sitteth upon the circle of the earth; and thus, we recommend to his care our bleeding country, confident that, in this struggle, in vindication of its injured rights, he will *avenge our cause, and execute judgment for us*.

I flatter myself, however, that I shall be able to point out some good effects which the Lord intends to bring about by this war.

* Ps. xcvii.

First. In its very greatest evil-, I can perceive actual benefits. The sufferings which it causes, will exercise the saints to godliness, and promote their holiness, their usefulness, and their future happiness. The change in the state of property which it produces, must inculcate in the bosom of the virtuous, dependence on God, the only unchangeable good ; and as to others, I can trust to the wisdom of Heaven, since God knows better than we do, in whose hands the multitude of gold and silver will be of the most value in the world. The havoc made by the sword, cuts off many of the wicked from annoying the earth ; and the godly who fall are delivered from temptation and trouble, and hastened home to the enjoyment of a great reward. Immorality itself, will in fine be overruled by Him, who numbers the hairs of our head, for his own glory and the welfare of his chosen sons and daughters.

Second. The American war brings to notice, among the thinking part of society, among the scholars and the statesmen, throughout the nations, great and important principles of moral order, the knowledge of which, has been heretofore confined to a few of comparatively little influence in the world.

The *essential principles* of the social compact, as arising from the constitution of human nature, and declared in the word of God—a compact, *necessary* indeed, and yet *voluntary* upon the part of each

member, will thus become a subject of more general examination. It is not merely for "*free trade and sailors' rights*," that this contest was intended by the Governor of the world: it was to illustrate the principles of national morality with which these practical questions are necessarily associated. The proper independency of nations, each of all others, is a subject of consideration. The true nature of *allegiance*, due in proportion to the *protection needed, asked for, and enjoyed*, is exhibited to view; so as to maintain the idea that man is as free to choose his residence as his employment, his country as his wife, his ruler as his servant: the rights of industry and commercial intercourse, to be equably granted to all the nations; and admitted by others to be without restraint, while prosecuted openly and honourably, are hereby made a subject of general attention and discussion. These topics are urged at an interesting crisis in the civilized world—by the ability and eloquence of our secretaries and ambassadors—by the bravery of our troops and the success of our ships of war, they are forced upon the notice of kings and of emperors; of philosophers and of poets; of merchants, of mechanics, of husbandmen; yea, of all ranks of men. They will thus command a respect which politicians would scorn to yield to, the maxims of equity, or to the precepts of the word of God.

Third. By the present contest, America will acquire a respectable character in the family of nations.

She has long been abused and insulted for her peaceful demeanour. The belligerents of Europe acted towards this country, as if it had been *denationalized*. The weakness of the government, the cowardice of the people, and above all, the avidity of the merchants, were subjects of scorn and contempt abroad: but the shame is removed; the veterans of Wellington attest the prowess of our troops; and the world is astonished at the facility with which our naval heroes have conquered, when they met upon terms of equality, those who had conquered all other nations. The American character, in argument and diplomacy, in the council and upon the field, now stands confessed; and this is a guarantee against future insolence and aggression.

Fourth. As another effect of the contest, the American name, respected abroad, will communicate at home the impulse of patriotism. The love of country, weakened by familiarity with its enemies, and destroyed by the love of wealth, shortly after the war, which established the independence of America, will be revived by *this second war of independence*: and the several monied interests, which are set in operation independently of British commerce, as well as the growing influence of domestic literature and arts, will serve to cherish that passion in the breasts of the rising generation. Hereafter they will take an honourable pride in the deeds of their statesmen and their warriors; and it will be felt by themselves, and known to others, that on a

question of foreign opposition, they are all Americans.

Fifth. The doctrine of expatriation, and the true nature of allegiance and protection, being hereafter better understood, will encourage the best part of the Protestants of Europe to seek an asylum in these lands, in the day of trial and of darkness, which awaits them in their own country. In vain should we conceal from ourselves the awful truth—Europe, *the Latin earth*, the scene of antichristian persecution, is to suffer more, infinitely more, than it has done in the last twenty years. The rejoicings which have taken place at the restoration of the Popish powers, shall be changed to lamentation and wo. The saints must yet suffer before the witnesses finish their testimony; and in America thousands will yet seek for hospitality and repose. They will be encouraged, from the well known fact, that we have vindicated by the sword the rights of the stranger.*

* It has been alleged, that the cause of naturalized citizens has been given up by the government: but happily the allegation is unfounded. Sad will be that day to America, if it ever should arrive, when such a violation of her own faith, and of the moral law, will receive her sanction. Then the curse of God will alight upon her shores; and be more terrible than all her present evils. But the allegation is unfounded. The *practice* of Britain, of which America complained, has ceased with the European war. We cannot force the *principle* upon any nation. The principle is our own. All we require of others is, not to injure us by their practice. But our Commissioners of peace are expressly instructed, never to yield the principle to the claims of the foe.

Sixth. The present war appears destined of the Lord, to *subserve the cause of the kings of the east in drying up the waters of Euphrates.**

This is a war for commercial freedom, and against the British monopoly. It is a contest, not only to prevent the recolonization of these states, but also in the Providence of God for extending the principles of *representative democracy*—the blessings of liberty, and the rights of self-government, among the colonies of Europe, which are found to the north and to the south of us. Like the wars of the old world, it is a shield from subjugation to the Spanish colonies, struggling for emancipation to the south; and independently of the idea of conquering Canada by our arms, it teaches to its inhabitants the benefits of peace with the United States. It will, in its consequences, diminish their attachment to England, and instruct them in the value of liberty. The very opposition which is made to this war is the means of ultimately strengthening the American democracy. Whatever may be the *designs* of the leaders of that opposition, the *arguments* employed by them are *democratic*, and these will not be forgotten. The appeals which are made to *the people* will make the people still more sensible of their own strength and importance. The societies which are formed, whether to support or to oppose the administration, are so many small democracies, which still tend to promote the principles of civil liberty. They are

jacobinical institutions, conducted with all the zeal, for power; but with more intelligence and order, than the Parisian associations. Nay, the very CONVENTION of the Eastern states, and all the opposition which the measures of this government have provoked in that part of our country, are predicated upon the principles of democracy. The war itself, and all the strife and the contention which it has produced, must therefore be considered, in the Providence of God, as the means of destruction to the slavish doctrines of the old world, and as ultimately tending to the general emancipation of the human race from the bondage of despotism and superstition.

CONCLUSION.

If I have given, in these discourses, any encouragement to the prosecution of this war, with valour, with unanimity, and with energy, I have done my duty. The faithful ministers of Christ give, with divine approbation, *the golden vials full of the last plagues*, into the hands of the angels of war and of death; that they may be poured out upon the dominions of *the man of sin*. In common with others, I have a right to declare my sentiments; and in doing so, in a tone of respect for those who differ from me, I hope that the mere fact, of these sentiments being on the side of my country, and its government, in this contest, is not a reason for condemning them unheard, or of displeasure at me for giving them utterance.

I have spoken upon this subject, as a WHIG—as the friend of religion and liberty—as a consistent Presbyterian, averse from arbitrary power. Our fathers, my dear hearers, were of that stamp. Our brethren in the Reformed Church, (for I have spoken their sentiments concerning all the great moral principles which I have discussed,) are now, and have been from the dawn of the reformation, Whigs from conscience.* The Puritans, the Presbyterians, the Martyrs, supported the

*The origin of the political and distinctive names, WHIG and TORY, deserves to be known. It is an *Index* to the correct application of them.

“This year (1679,) is remarkable for being the epoch of the well known epithets of WHIG and TORY, by which this island has been so long divided. The court party reproached their antagonists with their affinity to the fanatical conventiclers in Scotland,” (so it suited an *atheist-tory*, for David Hume was no *democrat*, to stigmatize the most pious people of the age,) “who were known by the name of Whigs. The country party found a resemblance between the courtiers and the Popish banditti, in Ireland, to whom the appellation of Tory was affixed.” *Hume’s Charles II. Chap. IV.*

“They were for confining the royal prerogative within the limits of the law, for which reason their adversaries charged them with *republican principles*, and gave them the reproachful name of Whigs; a name first given to the most rigid covenanters. The Tories went into all the arbitrary court measures, and adopted into our religion, a *Mahometan principle*, under the name of Passive Obedience, and Non-resistance; which, since the times of that impostor, who first broached it, has been the means to enslave a great part of the world.” *Neal’s Hist. Puritans, Vol. IV. p. 573.*

“The name of *Whig* took its rise in the reign of Charles II. and was bestowed on the best patriots then in the kingdom. True and genuine *Whigism*, therefore, consists in a zealous attachment to the liberties of mankind.” *Old Whig.*

same principles, in their faithful opposition to the throne, and the prelacy of tyrannical England. The monuments of their faith and their sufferings, are still to be seen by the traveller, in every part of that guilty land; and their blood, like that of Abel, still calls for vengeance upon the successors of the persecutors, the advocates of the crown and the mitre—the BRITISH 'TORIES.

The spirit of true religion is friendly to civil liberty. It has appeared to be so in every country. The most faithful of the reformers with patriotic ardour contended with the sword in defence of their civil and religious liberties. ULRIC ZUINGLE, the morning-star of the reformation, fell in battle at Zurich, 1530,* at the commencement of the strife against arbitrary power; and towards the close of the struggle which terminated in the overthrow of the purest of the churches, RICHARD CAMRON fell at *Airsmoss*, 1680, while defending, as a Christian hero, the religion and liberties of his country, against the tyranny of the bishops, and the royal house of Stuart.†

* Mosheim, Vol. IV. page 353.

† There, said Robert Murray, who cut off the head and hands of Mr. Camron, and presented them to the king's council, "*There are the head and hands, that lived praying and preaching, and died praying and fighting.*" The tyrannical council, in the refinement of cruelty, ordered them to be shown to his worthy Father, now in prison for the same cause. He was asked if he knew them. The good man took them in his hands, kissed them, and said, "*I know them, they are my son's, my dear son's: Good is the will of the Lord, who cannot wrong me or mine.*"

Crookshank's Ecc. Hist. Vol. II. p. 99.

So far as I, too, may still retain any portion of the spirit of my *native land*, where *Wallace* fought, where *Buchanan* wrote, where *Knox* preached the gospel of God, where the *Martyrs*, down from *Patrick Hamilton* to *James Renwick*, left their flesh to rest in hope of deliverance—that spirit is opposed to the impious misrule of a corrupt hierarchy and immoral power. If I have caught the spirit of this, the country of my choice, it is in favour of liberty. If I claim a place among consistent *Protestants*, I must testify against all the acts of *antichristian power*. If I follow the steps which are died by the blood of the *Martyrs*, I must raise my voice against the thrones which shed that blood. If the Bible is my system of religion, and of social order, I must disclaim attachment to those powers that are hostile to evangelical doctrine, and to the *rights* of the church of God. If, in so doing, I have offended any of my hearers, it is without intending it: for I watch for your souls, and desire to promote your welfare and your happiness. I have spoken, what I felt it my duty to speak, without respect of persons. Time will determine whether I have erred or not: And I leave the consequences, as it respects myself and all that is dear to me—as it respects the *cause of America* in the present contest, to GOD MY REDEEMER, *to whom be glory for ever and ever.*—AMEN.

FIVE DISCOURSES

ON

THE PRESENT WAR.

- | | |
|---|--|
| I. The right of discussing, from the pulpit, those great political questions which affect the morals and prayers of christians. | IV. The Application of this doctrine to the present War, with a particular examination of the question of Expatriation. |
| II. The Moral Character of the two Belligerents, the United States and Great Britain. | V. The end to be answered by this War, as a work of God's providence, independently of the immediate motives and causes of its origin and continuance. |
| III. The lawfulness of defensive war, and the duty of supporting it. | |

THESE Discourses were delivered during the apprehension of an attack upon this City, with design to show that it is the duty of all Christians, without respect to party, to give their undivided support to the *war* in which our country is providentially involved. With a view to promote the knowledge of correct principles; to aid the candid inquirer in forming a proper estimate of the present interesting crisis of our national concerns; to vindicate neglected truths; and to serve the cause of humanity, of his country, and of his God, the Author has consented to give them to the public.

